

THE
CHURCH OF MY BAPTISM
AND
WHY I RETURNED TO IT.

BY
W. F. H. KING.

"One Body."—EPH. iv. 4.

Paulist Fathers' Library.

LONDON : BURNS & OATES, LTD.
NEW YORK : CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
OF AMERICA LIBRARIES
Washington, D. C.

BURNS AND OATES, LTD., PRINTERS, LONDON, W.

A P R E F A C E

WHICH IS MEANT TO BE READ.

THE drift of the following pages is to point out certain of the inconsistencies of the Anglican theory: not—if the reader will believe me—with the view of taunting Churchmen with the blots referred to, but rather to put the question, whether the Divine character claimed for that Communion is confirmed by such manifest anomalies.

St. Paul says that “God is not the author of confusion, but of peace;” and although this may not be the best rendering of the original, it expresses pretty much what I mean here. Is a theory of the Church, so difficult to explain, so hard to understand, so awkward to manage, so fruitful in complication and contradiction, likely to be the true theory taught by Our Lord to His Apostles? Is a view that requires such an elaboration of statement likely to be, the view that Christ intended the Church to present to the masses—to the poor, the uneducated, and the unintelligent? In short, must not the Divine doctrine of the Church—if it is to lead men to be saved in and by the Church—be something infinitely less complex, infinitely more simple?

This is the point of the remarks that follow. God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, of simplicity, of order, of harmony, of consistency, of unity, and (I hope I may add with reverence) of intelligibility. Had the Anglican theory been pre-

valent in primitive times, it is not too much to say that the Gospel would never have touched the nations.

All that I can hope for is that some English Churchmen may be led to ponder these things. Thought is often pregnant with results. As long as I thoughtlessly accepted the theory of my communion, it was possible not only to remain in it, but to contribute energetically and even hopefully towards its extension. But once one began to test the position by Scripture, by history, or by present facts, then one difficulty after another kept arising; leading first to a suspicion, then a presumption, and lastly a conviction, that the National Church was the creation of man, forming no part of the One Body founded by the Lord.

Certainly it is vigorous enough, and a power in the country still; but the history of its establishment, and the privileges which that establishment secured it, are quite enough to account for its prolonged existence, and for the influence which it still exerts over many.

In the opening of the book I pursue a particular question to which I have never been able to get a plain answer. It is the question asked by no less a person than Bossuet of the famous Anglican divine of his day, Dr. Bull. *Qu'il daigne me dire comme à un zélé défenseur de la doctrine qu'il enseigne, ce que c'est donc qu'il entend par ce mot, Église Catholique?*

As Dr. Bull undertakes to answer Bossuet, I will quote his reply, or at least the main parts of it. He says: "I proceed to the Bishop's questions. . . . If he asks me what I mean by the Catholick Church, speaking of it as now it is? I answer: By the Catholick Church, I mean the Church universal, being a collection of all the

Churches throughout the world, who retain 'the faith once delivered to the saints'; that is, who hold and profess, in the substance of it, that faith and religion which was first delivered by the Apostles of Christ to the first original Churches. . . . All the Churches at this day which hold, etc., this faith and religion, however distant in place, or distinguished by different rites and ceremonies, yea, or divided in some extra-fundamental points of doctrine, yet agreeing in the essentials of the Christian religion, make up together one Christian Catholick Church under the Lord Christ, the supreme Head thereof." Further on he speaks of the Roman, Greek, and English (with "other particular Churches") as forming so many parts of the whole.

This is Bull's answer. As a definition of the Church it is rather a long one. Even omitting all that could be omitted, and quoting only what lawyers call "the operative parts," it runs to considerable length.* Nevertheless it is an important statement, if only for the fact that it faces the question instead of evading it, and even attempts a solution of the problem.

Yet I think I am justly entitled to say that Bull has failed to answer the question that Bossuet set him. He cannot, and will not lay his finger upon any one Church, or any known combination of Churches, as his explanation of the article in the Creed. He is, in fact, unable to give any positive answer to the repenting sinner who should ask him, Which is the Catholick Church?

When reduced to its shortest terms the Answer

* Compare, for instance, the Answer in the "Poor Man's Catechism."—*What is the Church?* The congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ, their unseen Head in Heaven, and His Vicar on earth, the Pope.

amounts to this: a theory of Rome, Greece and England (with other particular Churches), so framed as to represent an ideal "Catholick Church": and when this much has been arrived at, one has only to add that it is the speculative opinion of an Anglican divine, having nothing whatsoever to confirm it in fact. Nor does the adhesion of a hundred, or a thousand, or ten thousand more Anglican divines raise it to any higher value; for the same essential evidence of facts to support it is wanting. No such Church exists.

For the difficulty is this: that Holy Scripture and Christian antiquity speak *uno ore* but of One Body; endowed with a unity so essential that the loss of it is not merely deterioration, but death. To suppose, therefore, that three actually separated (and even hostile) communions can in any real sense be taken for the one Church of God, is to suppose something which has neither countenance in Scripture nor corroboration in fact.

This is the difficulty which English Churchmen can never be brought to admit. They wish for argument's sake to imagine that England, Rome, and the East make up one Church, and then they proceed to draw their conclusions as though the wish and the imagination were fact: knowing perfectly well all the time that the three communions are no more one, than the principals in a triangular duel are one person. Their triple enumeration of the Church, therefore, instead of being the threefold cord which they suppose, turns to a mere rope of sand that crumbles to pieces as soon as it is actually handled.

It is perfectly true that St. Paul again and again speaks of various "Churches," but he puts them all collectively before us as "One Body": each and all of them being as intimately united together as husband and wife, or as the body and its

members, or the stones in a building, or the tree and its branches, or the multitudinous particles composing a loaf of bread.

In the teaching of Our Lord it is the same. The net, the fold, the house, the great supper, the field, the vineyard—by whatever figure he portrays his Church, Oneness, or rather Manifoldness in Oneness is the prevailing characteristic.

Having taught the people by parable, He gave His last hours to His disciples alone. What was the subject of His discourse? The house of many mansions, the vine of many branches, concluding with the intercessory prayer "*that they all may be one.*" Nor was the unity with which He thus endows the Church an accidental property of it, but His own appointed witness before the eyes of men: "*I pray that they all may be one, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*" Nor, again, was the Church's unity to be a partial and perfunctory thing, but most absolute and complete. Other images had been already employed to impress this truth upon His hearers, but the most sublime and transcending conception of it was reserved for the night in which He was betrayed. Then, addressing Himself no longer to men—not even to the twelve—but to the Father only, He gives (as it were) the final touch and expression to all that had gone before. No earthly figure availed, even as no earthly comparison could fitly compare it. For so perfect should be the unity of His mystical Body that an adequate similitude could alone be found in the thought of God Himself, and in that highest type of union—the Plurality in Unity which is at once the distinction and the unity of the Blessed Three in One. Therefore He says—praying not only for the Apostles, but for the Apostolick Church in all stages and in all ages down to the end of time—

"I pray that they all may be one ; as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us ; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

If this be the view of Church unity presented by the Gospel, it must be pronounced most opposite both to Our Lord's words and intention to suppose them realised by a state of things which is not union but palpable division. On the other hand, any interpretation that squares with His teaching, has so much at starting to recommend it ; and if the most consistent interpretation be that of the Church of Rome, that circumstance cannot in equity be considered as a point in its disfavour.

There seems to be a sort of idea that Rome, being in possession of a quite extraordinary unity and no less undeniable Catholicity, is artfully presuming upon advantages supposed to have come to her by a kind of default, because no other can use them with equal success. To suppose, therefore, that to return to the Church of Rome is the same as returning to unity appears from such a point of view quite absurd, and even monstrous. I don't know if I make myself clear, but I am trying to express what I believe is felt by many when brought face to face with what are called "the Catholick claims." What I should say myself is that there is no reason why the name of the Church of Rome need enter at all into what may be called the preliminary view of the Church of Jesus Christ. It is not mentioned in the Gospels, nor, in so many words, in the whole of the New Testament. What Christians have to look for is some one homogeneous Body, corresponding in unity and universality with the undivided and world-wide Body promised by Our Lord. Such a Church only can have any claim upon the true disciple of Jesus Christ : and to no other, not possessing

these essential qualifications, can he for a moment give his adherence with consistency.

If of existing sects, the Roman Church alone perfectly fulfils these conditions, it has at once a claim to our consideration. Besides, what do we mean when we speak of the Church of Rome? We mean the See which by universal consent is the See occupied by St. Peter: and then we remember that upon Peter the Lord founded His Church, and that to Peter and to the Church thus founded the promises were made.

There is nothing, therefore, in Holy Scripture against such a Church possessing the properties of Oneness and Universality: the only question being whether these tokens are of human or of divine appointment. Is the unity of the Churches in communion with the Holy See the product of chance and of man? Or is it the continuous fulfilment of the promises, and the unfailing sign before the world that God has spoken and that Christ has come?

Another point to be noticed is this: that the religion taught in these pages is that which was the religion of every man, woman and child in England down to the apostasy of Henry VIII. That which is urged here was the faith of Bishop Scot of Chester, Heath, Bishop of Durham, Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury, and the rest of the divines who in Parliament or Convocation spoke in defence of the Catholick faith in the first year of Elizabeth. It is true that they were not powerful enough to hinder a revolution, but they bore witness to the ancient and immemorial belief of Christians in this country.

As it is very much *à propos*, the reply of (the poet and statesman) Count Friedrich L. von Stolberg

to Frederick William III. of Prussia, may be once more repeated here. In 1800 Stolberg made his submission to the Church of Rome and thereupon quitted office. The King was not pleased. "I do not like men who change their religion," he said to the Minister. "Neither do I, Sire," answered Stolberg; "and for that reason, when I found that our forefathers changed theirs two or three centuries ago, I felt bound to return to the Catholick faith."

Two minor matters must also be referred to. First, with reference to the quotations at the heads of the chapters. On account of space I have in three instances been obliged to omit certain portions of context in order to get the quotation in. In the case of the first chapter I have even been obliged to alter the form in which the question is asked. Bossuet was much too courteous to have written in the abrupt style with which I have credited him. (His actual expression will be found above on p. vi.) But I had to get the passage in somehow or other, and the politeness would not go into the four lines which was all that the printer allowed me.

The other thing is this: that my little book is an attempt to write on a controversial subject without using italics. No one who has not tried it knows how difficult or what a piece of self-denial it is to dispense with such aids. Nevertheless I have endeavoured to do without them, and as much as possible to avoid all such typographical tricks to catch the eye. Besides, I remember that Emerson (somewhere or other) tells us that we should never italicise, but so write that the emphasis should naturally fall upon the emphatic word; and, generally, that in all our published compositions we should be careful always to aim at a strict self-control.

CHAPTER I.

WHY I RETURNED.

Qu'est ce que c'est donc qu'il entend par ce mot, Eglise Catholique ? Est-ce l'Eglise Romaine, et celles qui lui adhèrent ? Est-ce l'Eglise Anglicane ? Est-ce un amas confus de sociétés séparées les unes des autres ?—BOSSUET. *Letter to Mr. Nelson respecting Dr. Bull.*

—I SUPPOSE, for the same reason that brought back others. Everyone who submits to the Church of Christ makes that submission, I imagine, chiefly in the hope that he may be saved, and not perish. At least, this was the uppermost thought at the last moment in my own mind.

Other reasons doubtless conspired to prevail with me ; reasons arising out of the circumstances of my life : besides those dictated by the correspondence of the actual Church of Rome with the marks of the Creed, with the plain drift of Scripture, and with every theory that I had ever formed of the Christian Church. But the immediate impulse was, undoubtedly, that I might save my soul alive ; and the time was short.

I.

The wonder is that I delayed so long : the call was, at times, so plain, so urgent. I used to start up in my

chair, or arrest myself suddenly in my walk and strike the ground with my stick, at moments when the conviction of the truth came rushing in upon me with especial force ; and I said, I must obey, I must go ; and I went not.

I used to be afraid to go to bed at night, lest I should die in my sleep, suddenly and alone, without sign or sound, and with all my sins upon my head. I was unwilling even to make prolonged stay in country places where no priest might be had, lest death should come on me unreconciled and disobedient.

I was afraid, because I had no excuse. I knew enough to see which was at least the safer course. I knew and had even copied out St. Augustine's teaching on the unpardonable sin, the sin against the Holy Ghost, the sin of schism: and I knew that whatever might prove to be the Church of Christ, I was not within its unity. There was the doctrine in my commonplace book to witness against me. How could I be anything but alarmed?

I tried to distract my thoughts with reading and with writing. In particular, I was always putting up the Anglican puzzle. I tried to work out a paper scheme of the Church and of our own inheritance in her. I applied the Branch (invisible Church) theory, the Suspension of unity theory, the Continuity theory, the New Revelation (or Reformation) theory—all and every device that the poor bewildered Anglican can bethink himself of in order to fit his Communion into the Body of Christ. But the pieces would never come right. The Anglican position would always stick out uglily by itself. I wished to state the dilemma constructively, it always ended destructively.

Such was the confusion in which I was involved, simply because I would not accept the plain teaching

of Scripture, and the obvious conclusions of the Creed. If I put the subject away and turned to other things, even then, whether I would or no, it returned upon me. There were tokens and hints and signs, in the world, in the events of the day, in the careless conversation of men, sufficient to show where lay the truth and where its counterfeit. At one time, so moved was I that I even wrote to a priest of whom I had heard, asking for an interview, and at the last moment had not the courage to post the letter.

2.

It may very fairly be asked with regard to all this period, Why, with such strong convictions in you, were you not faithful to them? Why should you not join the Roman Communion if you felt it to be the true? There is no proscription involved in such a step. There is nothing even singular in so doing: the journey is being made every day.

For all that, there may be cogent reasons keeping one back from the final decision. With the gravest doubts as to the security of the Church of England, there may be a very great reluctance to break with it altogether.

It holds and has held all that is nearest and dearest to one.* It exerts a powerful attraction and influence over us, even after we have made up our minds beyond recall that it is no part of the one Church founded by Our

* Converts are, I suppose, frequently reproached with forsaking the religion of their fathers. It is said, What would they have thought of it? What grief would it have caused them! I answer, How do you know that they would have disapproved? How do you know that they do disapprove? One of the greatest Saints that ever lived departed this life utterly and entirely mistaken upon the doctrine of one of the Sacraments. He thought he had the Scripture plainly on his side, and considered the teaching of the Holy See to be erroneous, even to the length of resisting the Pope and calling him many hard names. Yet it is now admitted on all hands—Protestant no less than Catholic—that it was St. Cyprian who was in error, and that Pope St. Stephen held the right doctrine. And St. Augustine, in his panegyric of St. Cyprian, assures

Lord. And when we come to inquire into this attraction, we begin to see that it does not lie in the system itself, but in the associations of it all. Other forms, every whit as much opposed to Rome, have no such particular interest for us. It is the associations, and these alone, that turn the scale in favour of the religion of our childhood. It is these that really influence us. The worship, the buildings, the books, the literature, the opinions—have a kind of reflected sacredness in our eyes, not for anything whatever in themselves, but solely and entirely by reason of the dear and tender and sacred memories with which our minds connect them.

One thinks, also, of the many, many pure-souled and exemplary Christian lives of men and women within the bosom of its Communion. Again, there are the hundreds of blameless, devoted clergymen who are spending themselves and being spent in a single-hearted service of God in that Church. Not only are they devoted workers, but many of them men of culture; intelligent, acute thinkers and observers: men, moreover, who have gone into the Roman question and made a study of the controversy. Is it possible that they could all be wrong, and I alone right?

It is not, then, the simple matter that it appears. It is one thing to have doubts respecting the Church of one's birth, and quite another to leave it. There may be a strong call Romeward, and then the call may become weak, or altogether silent. It comes and goes: bursts of light, and then as thick darkness as before. The argument may stand out for a moment before one in

us that no one would rejoice more in the discovery of his mistake than St. Cyprian himself: "especially where he now is, placed in such full light of truth, where he seeth most certainly what here most peacefully he sought" (*St. Aug. de Bapt.* 5, 17, 22, 23). St. Cyprian, it should be added, after a temporary rupture, died in communion with the Bishop of Rome.

luminous distinctness, and afterwards die out as though it had never been, and leave one blindly groping for the truth once more.

3.

And this I consider to be the primal curse of heresy—its obscuration of the spiritual vision.* The poet represents Satan entering Paradise to deceive our parents, “involved in rising mist ;” and

Like a black mist slow creeping he held on
His midnight search ;

and so do I conceive of the heresy with which he assails now the Church of Jesus Christ. Unable to teach anything with certainty or agreement, its office is to raise a perpetual cloud of vapour, concealing the truth from the eyes of the unwary ; and I should say that in no country in the world is this process of mystification carried on so persistently and so successfully as in England. Fictions and assumptions of Divided and Undivided Churches, of Independent Churches, of National Churches, of Visible and Invisible Churches, of Disputed and Undisputed councils, of Essential and Unessential doctrines, of Primitive Purity, of Roman error, of Papal usurpation—these, with all the rest of the Anglican traditions, diligently instilled into the mind from youth upward, are quite enough to obscure what otherwise should be most patent.

It never occurred to me that the Scriptures which I read, or the Creeds which I had been confessing from childhood, should be literally understood in their literal meaning. Supposing their conclusions pointed not to ourselves, but to Rome ; I knew that they were of no

* “It is the way with all heretics,” says St. Augustine (*c. Ep. Parmenian. 2, 6*), “not to be able to see a thing, though it is established among all nations as clear as daylight ! And yet, whatever they contrive in schism with all the skill and earnestness possible, is as powerless to avert the wrath of God as cobwebs would be to keep off the cold.”

importance ; or, if important, that they were only to be controverted and denied. What, if the Gospels (and New Testament generally) combined to invest the person of St. Peter with a singular pre-eminence ? I could show that the claims of St. Paul, or St. James, or St. John were equal, if not superior. If stress were laid on the unique character of the commission given to St. Peter by Our Lord, I could reply that the same powers were entrusted to all the Apostles. If the Scriptures and the Crœds declared the Church to be one—what was this to me who started with the *πρῶτον ψεύδος* of Anglicanism, that the Church is not one, but three ? Indeed, the whole of my difficulties in a nutshell, the perplexities of years, may be summed up as a prolonged attempt to square the facts of Church history with this initial false assumption.

That there can be but One Body, and that its parts must be in living, visible union with the whole ; that the Church of Christ must be that which both is, and which is called Catholick—whether it be centred at Rome, Canterbury, or Constantinople ; and that all which is not in union with that centre is in schism—this I failed to see. That which the prophet promised should be so evident that the fool and the wayfaring man could not mistake it, was mistaken by me. Nor (to come to the title of these pages) did I understand that in submitting to the Holy See I was not forsaking, but returning to the Church of my baptism. But I understand it now ; and it seems to me that many who still view the Catholick Church with suspicion and alarm, would lose their fears if they understood that in returning to her they are returning to the common Mother of us all.

4.

Of late years—but only of late years—a like claim has been made on the part of the Church of England, in

order to deter its members from a return to Unity. The sinfulness of leaving the Church of their baptism has been made a strong moral ground of appeal to those who were wavering in their allegiance to the national Church. The person baptized by an English clergyman was, as it were, *ipso facto* committed to the fortunes of Anglicanism, and his loyalty, if not his safety, was involved if he deserted. But as soon as we perceive that no one, child or adult, though baptized in the Church of England, is baptized into the Church of England—what becomes of the sin of rejecting it? It becomes, rather, a duty to continue in the Church into which we were baptized, or if we have departed from unity, to return as soon as we become aware of the fact.

Will anyone tell me, then, into what Church we were admitted at our second birth, if it was not the Roman? It will hardly be maintained that we were baptized into the Church of England. Certainly the Prayer Book does not countenance the idea, and Anglican text-books of the day expressly deny it. In his *Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church*, the Rev. T. Moore points out what is the teaching of the Prayer Book on the subject. He says :

When a child is brought to be baptized, the Church prays, *not* [author's italics] that it may be received merely into the Church of England, but that it may be "received into Christ's Holy Church." Again, when the child is baptized, she does *not* [author] say "we receive this child into the congregation of the Church of England," but she does say "we receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock." And she declares it to be grafted, *not* [author] into any local Church, but "into the body of Christ's Church." Our Church thus in Holy Baptism loses sight of her own individuality as a local Church ; and thinks of, acts only in the name of that Holy Church throughout the world of which she confesses herself to be a part.*

* *Englishman's Brief, etc.* S. P. C. K., 1880, pp. 2, 3.

Thus far the teaching of the Prayer Book, according to Mr. Moore. Nor can anything be more positive and emphatic than his statement. His argument is, I should add, repeated in almost identical language by the Rev. Canon Venables, in his *Church of England*, and by the Rev. E. B. Trotter, in his *Early History of the Church of England*; and must be held to be adopted by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which publishes these books. In fact, it has become now almost a stock commonplace of Anglican apologists in proof of the real Catholicity of their Communion.

If, then, I go to the Book of Common Prayer to ask if I was baptized into the Church of England, I am met with the decisive reply that I was not. The Anglican Communion is, in short, the Church of the natural birth, not of the spiritual.

Was I baptized into an invisible Church? Here, again, the Prayer Book answers in the negative. But I will quote, as before, the testimony of an Anglican divine:

"If our services are to be Scriptural, they must give no countenance to the idea that there are two Churches, a visible and an invisible. . . . Our services recognise but one Church—the visible, into which the person is admitted at Baptism. . . . There is, then, but one Church recognised in the services, and it is described in terms which leave no room for any other, for it is called Christ's Holy Church, etc." "The covenant of God has always been with this visible Church. The Word of God has always been addressed to this outward visible Body. No interior or 'invisible' Church within this outward Body is ever recognised in God's Word as a separate Church." *

Now this passage throws considerable light upon the object of my inquiry. I make real progress. The Church of my baptism is shown to be not only One, but Visible. Add to this the already ascertained fact that (whatever

* Rev. M. F. Sadler, *Church Doctrine, Bible Truth*, 1873, pp. 85, 86, and 42.

else it may be) it is not the Church of England, and the search ought to be now near its goal. Where is it? What is it? Which is it? The chase is becoming keen and close: and, just as I think I have my hand upon the prey, I am pulled up. By what? By Mr. Moore, with the whole Anglican Communion at his back, telling me in the most earnest tones that though the national Church is not itself the Church of my baptism, yet that it is a branch of it.

5.

The branch theory! Ah! what have I not suffered from this fiction of Anglicanism; how much has it not cost me! A notable instance, indeed, of the way in which the simplest images of language may be abused.

At all times it behoves those who employ figurative terms to see that they be correctly used, or, at least, that there be no glaring confusion. But when a particular phrase is adopted by a religious body, to serve as the logical *rationale* of its whole history and status, summing it all up in a single word—then we have a manifest right to demand that the analogy be accurately preserved. Of such a kind is this figure of the tree and its branches, by which the Anglican hopes to explain satisfactorily his relations towards the Catholick Church, and which is repeated and passed on from one to the other as the *mot d'énigme*, without giving a thought to the real import of the simile.

For what is its real signification? In itself, as the expression of a living, growing organism—the whole perfectly coherent in all its parts—no figure could be more natural or more apposite. In this way it is applied to the Church both by the Fathers and by St. Paul. Nay, it is peculiarly consecrated to this connection by our Blessed Lord Himself, saying, “I am the Vine, ye are the branches.”

Now, observe the Anglican use, or rather misuse, of the trope : the branch is severed from the trunk, and yet it is supposed to be still united ! Can self-contradiction go further ?

It is perfectly true that the possible separation of the branch from the tree enters into a correct use of the figure. Indeed, it is necessarily involved as a complementary aspect of the case. It forms part of Our Lord's own allegory ; but then it is to show the fatal effects of such abscission. So also the Apostle, who holds up the broken-off branch of the Jews as a salutary warning to the Christian.

So, again, St. Cyprian :

The Church is likewise one, though she be spread abroad and multiplies with the increase of her progeny; even as the tree has boughs many, yet its strength is one, seated in the deep-lodged root. Break a branch from the tree; once broken it can bud no more, etc.—*De Unitate*, 4.

So, also, the secular historian :

The Church of England was as a limb lopped from the Catholic trunk ; it was cut away from the stream by which its vascular system had been fed ; and the life of it, as an independent and corporate existence was gone for ever.—*Froude Hist.*, vol. vii., p. 174.

I am very far from sympathising with Mr. Froude's opinions on ecclesiastical matters, but I suppose that no one will deny the historical fact which he here affirms. That the Anglican Church has for three centuries been severed from the Communion with which it was till then united—is a circumstance upon which there can be no two opinions. How, then, is it in any way a branch of that Communion, except as a branch lopped off and lying upon the ground ? And what becomes of the argument based upon this misuse of terms, and intended to give assurance to confiding Christians of their membership in the one Body of the Church of God ?

At last (to make confusion worse confounded) the unhappy simile experiences a further distortion. The rootless, trunkless, dissevered, prostrate, and separated branches are made to erect themselves from the ground and assume the functions of individual trees ; and the Archbishop of Canterbury says* that " Complete union is a question of many years to come, but Christianity is like a noble tree : the branches may be separate, but they have a common growth."

Of course, we may amuse ourselves, if we please, with the idea that England and the East are still integral parts of a corporate whole ; just as an enthusiastic and imaginative Frenchman may divert himself with the idea that Elsass-Lothringen is still part of France because it once was so, and will be, he hopes, again. But the illusion ceases to be amusing when it is put forward as the foundation of the Anglican position, and as a true interpretation of the Article in the Creed (*and one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church*).

This comes of playing with words and names of special consecrated meaning which do not belong to you ; beguiling the unwary with a perverted use of them ; deceived, and deceiving others in matters of the most momentous import to the soul. Here was I, for instance, distressed beyond measure to see the complete negation of unity which Anglicanism implies, and alarmed for my own salvation lest I should be without, and not within, the One Fold ; and, on a question literally of life and death, this was all the comfort I could get ! A theory of unity held only by a school within the Church of England, and contradicted by facts, contradicted by common sense, contradicted by history, by the world, and by Scripture ; contradicted, finally, by the very Communion with which

* Speech at Canterbury. *Guardian*, October 30th, 1889.

I was assured I was united* ! For the theory required me to believe the thing which was not : viz., that the East and the West had reunited, and had admitted the Anglican Church into fellowship with them, so making one Body. But am I waking or dreaming ? Are Greece and Rome one, or separate ? Hold either of them any communion with England ? And is this tripartite enumeration the Greek or the Latin doctrine of Church unity, and their agreed interpretation of the Article in the Creed ? If I have not taken leave of my senses, I know as surely as I hold this pen between my fingers that both of them would reject the proposition with scorn ; and yet I am invited to believe that it is not only the correct exposition of the doctrine, but that it represents an actually accomplished state of things !

* We forget that outside of England the Anglican theory of unity is absolutely unintelligible. Catholicism, or the Orthodox Religion, or the Evangelical Churches of one kind or another, present notions which the European nations are able to grasp ; but the distinctions of Anglicanism are beyond them. No one stated the Tractarian principle more correctly than did Mr. W. Palmer in his visit to the Russian Church in 1840, but he was not understood. "You admit, then," said the Metropolitan of Moscow, "the Oriental, the Latin Catholic, and the British Churches all at once." "Yes," I replied, "each in its original diocese or region, not otherwise." The Metropolitan said : "I cannot understand this ; do many of you hold this theory ? I think it can be anything but general." "Our Church," said Mr. Palmer, "has never excommunicated the Greek Churches nor the Latin Churches of the Continent ; only, we excommunicated the Romanists who are in England, and in Ireland, and in Greece, and in Russia, as *schismatics*." "That is what I cannot in the least understand," said the Metropolitan ; "they are all the same with the Latins of the Continent ; communion depends on unity of belief. If they are fit to be communicated with abroad, they ought to be one with you at home ; if they are to be excommunicated at home they are to be excommunicated everywhere." Count Pratasoff, a much greater dignitary than the Archbishop of Moscow, being the Ober-Prokuror of the Holy Synod, said, "On that principle you would be a Universalist, changing your religion with your dwelling-place as often as you crossed the frontier from country to country."—See Palmer's *Visit to the Russian Church*, chap. lxxiv.

If I am wrong, let it be shown that I am wrong. It was truth that led me to the Church, and there is nothing else in this world that is worth fighting for for half-an-hour. But that which on inspection turns out to be a figment deserves to be rejected: and when upon this figment is made to hang the salvation of thousands of priceless souls, it deserves not only to be rejected, but to be repudiated and exposed with a feeling little short of indignation.

6.

I return, then, to my original question—for it has not been answered—Where is the Church of my baptism, if it be not the Church of Rome? Where is this mysterious “Catholick Church” of which Anglicans are always speaking, and to which they believe that they belong? It is not invisible, but visible. It is not in the air, but upon the earth. It is not a congeries of independent sects: for the Scriptures and the Creeds declare it to be One Body. It must be one of the Oriental communions. But which of them? Is it the Greek, the Constantinopolitan, or the Orthodox? Is it the Jacobite, the Coptic, or the Abyssinian? Is it the Monophysite, Armenian, or Nestorian? Is it all these associated together? But no such confederation exists. Is it a combination of any two or more of them? But no such combination is known. Of which of these then, individually, is the Church of England a member; with which of these is it in visible communion; from which does it derive, by actual cohesion, its rank and status of Catholic?

Who will answer this question? I have asked English Churchmen again and again without attaining any result. They shy at it, they evade it, they circle round it in flights of verbiage; or they try to put it aside by counter-accusations against the Church of Rome. They will in

short, do anything rather than look the question steadily in the face. Never, at the best, have I received an answer that did not fall back upon the idea of an invisible body or of invisible union. Never, upon the premises that the Church is visible, and that its parts must be visibly united, have I received an answer to the question, What is that Church of which the Anglican Communion asserts itself to be a part? It does not concern me now, but it is the question of questions for English Churchmen, since upon it depends their claim to membership in the one Body founded by Our Lord.

The reason why this question has never been answered, is because it is unanswerable. The "Catholick Church," of which Anglicanism is for ever speaking in its pulpits and in its publications and to which it is always appealing and referring, has not and never has had any earthly existence, visible or invisible, save in the imagination of those who could find no other possible way of escape from the dilemma.

I commend the question to the consideration of Dr. Littledale, and to all those who are supporting his attack upon the Holy See. I commend also to his notice the passages I have quoted from the Prayer Book and from Anglican divines, together with the conclusions to which they point.

I ask him, further, what is that Church that has most manifestly upon her all the marks of the Creed—Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity; and what is that Body into which both he and I were baptized, if it be not that Church which our Blessed Lord speaks of building upon Peter, and which Peter, together with Paul, founded at Rome, and poured out on it all their doctrine with their blood? * And I pray him—*Si quis adhuc precibus locus*—for his own soul's sake, no less than for the sake of

* *Tertull. de Præscr.* 36 : *Irenæus adv. Hæc.* iii. 3.

those whom his misleading words are keeping from the way of salvation, I pray him cease reviling and defaming the mother that bare him again unto Christ at His second birth.

CHAPTER II.

ANGLICAN CONTROVERSY.

Roma errat ; Hierosolyma errat ; Alexandria errat ; Antiochia errat ; totus mundus errat ; soli tantum Scoti et Britones rectum sapiunt !—CUMMIAN (Irish monk of 7th cent). *Epist. ad Segien.*

SOMEONE was asking me the other day what it was that first stirred these doubts upon the security of Anglicanism. I forget what I answered, but it set me thinking. What was it that first made me suspect the Church of England ? Was it the charges of the Bishops ? The debates in Convocation ? The audacious statements of Broad Church divines ? The various and varying Ecclesiastical judgments ? I could not remember. All these (and much more) contributed to keep the mind in a state of unrest, many of them being painful and most shocking ; but the precise point where the current of thought ceased setting in the direction of Anglicanism, and turned definitely and finally Romeward, this I could not lay my finger upon. But at last I found it. I found the very subject, author, book—the most unlikely and innocuous that could be imagined (who would have guessed it ?)—Canon Curteis' *Bampton Lectures* !

The book has, I am told, been instrumental in bringing

over Dissenting ministers to the Established Church, but it was certainly a prime means in converting me to Popery. Nothing could be more casual and unintended than the way in which it gave this new turn to my thoughts. But its influence was unmistakable, and its immediate effect, as regards my Anglicanism, was even more disastrous still, as I shall presently show.

The passage * that I was reading in the book was on "Forged citations from the Fathers," a "series of gross forgeries"—forged, that is to say, by Romanists. I read this with attention. I made extracts, and copied out passages as I went on. I knew that Roman Catholick authorities were never to be trusted, and I had a positive pleasure in getting hold of chapter and verse to prove the point. In this way I went through all the forgeries, St. Cyril, St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, and Tertullian. At last I came to Irenæus—I was staggered. Even with Canon Curteis' qualifying remarks it startled me. I looked out the place in St. Irenæus: it was even worse than I thought. And this was not all. This was not even the principal thing. It was not merely that the Roman claims appeared to me in a new light, but that, for the first time in my life, I began to suspect the truthfulness of Anglican controversialists.

2.

It may be imagined what a shock this was to me. I never had conceived it possible that Anglican writers could be dishonest. The dishonesty was notoriously on the other side. I remember the Reformation pictures of my childhood, where the Papists were always represented with angry brows, dark and scowling eyes, and vicious mouths; while the bland and ingenuous countenances were distributed amongst Cranmer and Luther, and Elizabeth and Knox. It was part of the respective

* Curteis' *Bampton Lectures*, 1872, pp. 145 *et seq.*

characters of the two sides. Straightforwardness was the badge of the one, just as shuffling, and evasion, and mendacity were typical of the other. And here was a blameless English divine stooping to something perilously akin to such chicanery himself! The omissions, unfair quotations, unfair translations, misrepresentations, glossings, and minimisings that I had thought the exclusive property of Rome, were here to be recognised—in principle at least—in the case of more than one of the passages as cited by the author.

But, after all, I am not putting forward these *Lectures* as a typical case of Anglican misrepresentation, or (to use the gentle language of Church of England controversialists) of Anglican forgeries. If I wanted to name a capital instance, I should mention a text-book which is to be found in the hands of almost every theological student, and in the library of almost every clergyman of the Established Church—*Theophilus Anglicanus*. On the contrary, the faults in Canon Curteis' book are neither numerous nor flagrant, and I am perfectly willing to believe that they were committed unintentionally and in good faith. The only reason, in short, for alluding to the book is its curious connection with my conversion. I will go even further, and confess that from an Anglican point of view I do not see how it can be avoided. What else is to be done? We appeal to primitive antiquity, and the Romanist meets us on our own ground. We are driven to the Fathers, and the Fathers witness against us. What can we do then? Why, we must bring forward certain places that obviously tell for our side; and as for the passages that tell the other way, we must ignore or suppress what we can, and explain away the rest.

We have only to descend a step lower in the controversial scale to see the same principle adopted by the

Nonconformist in defending his position against an Established Church. The Dissenters have slipped away from the Church of England just as the Church of England, before them, had severed itself from the Mother of us all. What, therefore, they hold in common with Anglicanism—the Scriptures—to that they turn for confirmation of their peculiar doctrines. In vain does the Anglican show that the Bible, taken as a whole, witnesses to Episcopacy, to Baptism, to a sacramental system, to orders of ministers, formularies of belief, unity, and other Church truths. It is all to no purpose. The Presbyterian and the Baptist can still confront the Churchman with a selection of stock texts which to them seem honestly unanswerable, and more than a sufficient justification for maintaining their separated position.

And what the Wesleyan and the Baptist effect with their Bible, that does the Anglican with both the Scriptures and antiquity together, in his contest with a still greater antagonist. A judicious use of the Fathers can do wonders for the Church of England. Cyprian and Augustine can be made to furnish arguments for its independence, if you omit their recognition of the Apostolick See as the fount of unity and order. Tertullian can be made to give damaging evidence against the Papacy, if you read him only after he had lapsed into Montanism. Irenæus can be pressed into the service of the Protestant, if you account for the superiority which he attaches to the Roman Church on purely political and physical grounds; Jerome, if you omit his letter to Pope Damasus; St. Bernard, if you omit his Epistle to Eugenius; Gregory the Great, if you take his rejection of the title of Universal Bishop, and suppress the passages in which he claims an absolute supremacy over every Church and Bishop in Christendom, not excepting Constantinople itself.

In this way, Churchmen may turn Christian antiquity to excellent account, so long as they are not found out. But I had found them out, and doubts once aroused refused to be quieted, all the more that the original trust in my own party had been so implicit and unbounded. I had all the suspicions and resentment of a confiding ally who finds that he has been deceived. Having caught one Anglican writer tripping, I began to distrust others. Histories, commentaries, translations, dictionaries, editions—especially such works as are put into the hands of the clergy and candidates for orders—I could no longer take on trust where it came to any point in dispute between us and Rome. They had to be tested; and in almost every case they proved, on examination, to be a perversion of the real facts of the case.

3.

The wonder is, that I preserved belief in anything or anybody. I really believe that St. Irenæus saved me. When my faith in the Church of England received so staggering a blow, it was he that came forward to point me where sure support for my feet was to be found: and I never take out the old folio from my shelf without feelings of singular gratitude and veneration. I read the celebrated passage that Mr. Curteis introduced me to; I read other parts throughout the volume; and the religion which I found there was so harmonious and consistent, so compacted and surely founded: so conspicuous in authority, so unequivocal in teaching, so unwavering in tone, that I could no longer believe that the Rome which was the centre of it all could be the seat of error that she was represented.

Rather, she seemed to rise before me out of the dimness of the second century with imperial, majestic mien, and with tokens of assured victory upon her

brow. She was proscribed, persecuted, and in hiding. Swarms of ephemeral heresies were seeking to deprave the integrity of her faith. Paganism and a cultured indifferentism joined hands to ridicule her teaching and her rites, and the state was putting her children by thousands to the sword. Yet at this moment, from her sanctuaries in the catacombs, she had already her hand laid upon the world. The splendid promise of the poet which he fondly bequeathed to the empire of Augustus,

His ego nec metas rerum, nec tempora pono:
Imperium sine fine dedi,

was already taking shape in that kingdom of hers which should never be destroyed. Already was she the mother and mistress of nations, peoples, and languages: planting and extending her churches from Germany to Libya, and from the Caucasus to the gates of the West; and holding all together by union with herself, and by the imposition of a faith as single and pervading as the light of the sun in the firmament above.

CHAPTER III.

THE UNITY OF THE FAITH.

Ideo regnum Ecclesiæ manebit in æternum, quia individua fides, corpus est unum.—S. AMBROSE. *In Luc. Lib. vii. n. 91.*

BUT there is a much more serious aspect of the question than any such economies of controversialists as I have alluded to above. I refer, of course, to true doctrine, and to that regard for truth, which we suppose all men without exception to have respecting those things which are proposed to them for belief. To put it in other words : we desire not only to believe, but to believe what is sure, as opposed to mere opinion. Believing the Church, we believe that whatever she proposes is infallibly true ; and it is the truth of the creed, when conveyed to us in this way, that makes it precious in our sight, so precious indeed that for it we would gladly die.

This is what, I suppose, many Anglicans will agree to, and it is certainly what the Catholick Church teaches. But I go on to assert that the Church of England is, in this connection, perfectly regardless of truth ; and that this insensibility of hers is not merely a symptom of Anglicanism, but the most alarming and portentous of all the manifold disorders which rage within her walls.

I.

Assuming, for a moment, that the proposition is well founded, I observe an extraordinary degeneracy in the present condition of things as contrasted with the faith, or at least with the principles of the Reformation.

Cœpisti melius quam desinis ; ultima primis cedunt, we may fairly say to the Anglican Communion of to-day. For it was not always so. Look at the beginning of her history, when her claim to the regard of her members was founded upon her monopoly of the truth. The accession of Elizabeth was proclaimed as the return of true religion. The note of her Church was the preaching of the pure Word of God ; and in the forefront of the Bible her successor is complimented as a tender nursing-father who had maintained and propagated the truth of Christ.

It was a forcible argument in its way—this idea of the thick and palpable clouds of falsehood and superstition clearing away in the sixteenth century, and truth, in all its native and primitive purity, descending upon the Church and realm of this favoured land. It was a telling argument to employ to plain-spoken, downright Englishmen. I make bold to say it is a good argument still, and the only one that is consistent. Just as, on the other hand, the substitution of arguments based upon a theoretical continuity cuts the ground from under the Anglican's feet, and leads him—if the argument is pursued to its logical conclusion—to the Church of Rome. But with this I am not going to occupy myself, being entirely concerned with inquiring how the Church of England treats this chief credential of her mission to the world, and how far her practice entitles her to the confidence of her adherents.

2.

What have the Scriptures to say on this point ? I read

that the Lord, Himself the Truth, promises the Spirit of Truth to guide His Apostles into all the truth. His Apostle, St. Paul, exhorts his converts all to speak the same thing, that there be no schisms among them, but that they be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. The teaching of the Apostles is not, he asserts most emphatically, a variable quantity, to be affirmed one moment and denied the next* ; but a constant and unchanging tradition. It is, in short, one faith† ; and he speaks of the baptized coming (through the Church's teaching) into the unity of the faith‡, and so being preserved from being tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine. To Timothy, the Apostle speaks of the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth ; bids him see that one doctrine only was taught§, and take heed unto the doctrine himself, and so save his own soul and the souls of those that heard him. He refers to the case of two persons who had erred from the truth, and who for their errors had been excommunicated||. He speaks, also, of the form of sound words¶ which he had taught Timothy ; bids him keep that which had been delivered to his trust, and commit the same to faithful men who should be fit to teach others also.

Now, what is most conspicuous in the view which we get here of the teaching of the Apostle is, unquestionably, its integrity and completeness. It was one faith. Being the truth revealed by the Spirit of Truth, it could not be differently taught in different parts of the earth, but must necessarily be a fixed and unchanging message. It was the bond of union for the Church, the basis of all morals, and the instrument of the believer's salvation. Such is it represented in principle, and in practice it is the same. Bishops keep and preach the faith with exact-

* 2 Cor. i. 17—19.

† Eph. iv. 5.

‡ *Ibid.* vv. 13, 14.

§ 1 Tim. i. 3.

|| *Ibid.* ver. 20. ¶ 2 Tim. i. 13.

ness, and transmit it unimpaired to their successors. The faithful, in the same way, are charged to observe a perfect identity of belief, so preventing divisions; and if a man persisted in depraving the truth he was expelled.

3.

Nor, when we skip eighteen centuries and examine the wording of the latest Lambeth Encyclical, do we find anything at variance with the rule of the Apostle. "We declare," say the 145 Anglican Bishops in 1888, "that we are united under one Divine head, in the fellowship of the one Catholick and Apostolick Church, holding the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed Œcumenical Councils."* It is when we come to look into the practical working of these fair-sounding professions; when we inquire, not what may be the tenor of the written formularies of the Church of England, but what is the actual teaching of its living teachers—it is then that amazement seizes one that, with a full knowledge of the facts, the Lambeth Fathers could have dared to subscribe such a document.

For what are the facts? Only these: that the faith taught by the national Church, instead of being the homogeneous body of doctrine it is represented to be, is broken up into a litter of discordant and contradictory fragments. Instead of being the immutable and unequivocal *Yea* which the Apostle declared the Church's teaching to be, it is literally the *Yea and the Nay*, the *It is* and the *It is not*, which he most unequivocally denied to be the case.† The Church of England professes one faith and teaches another. It has a faith on paper—in the Creeds and Articles; and it has another for the pulpit and the press; where as many different doctrines may

* *Lambeth Conferences.* S. P. C. K., 1889, p. 275.

† 2 Cor. i. 17—19.

be propounded as there are parties and sub-divisions of parties to formulate them. Nor is there any limit, beyond the natural limits of human ingenuity, to the number of different views which may be broached on any doctrine that may be in question. The reality of the Gospel priesthood, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the Real Presence, the necessity of private confession, may be and are respectively affirmed or denied by ministers of the Established Church.

All these points of doctrine just named you will find, for instance, denied in the *Cautions for the Times*, edited by Archbishop Whately. On the subject of the Christian priesthood, it is stated that whereas priest in the Bible means a sacrificer, in the Prayer Book it means an elder or presbyter. It is pointed out that throughout the New Testament there is no mention of sacrificing priests under the Gospel scheme but Jesus Christ Himself; and that the absence of earthly priests and sacrifices (as well as temples and altars) is a proof that Christianity was not devised by man. "It is quite incredible," continues the writer, "that if the Apostles really believed that there were sacrificing priests under the Gospel system, they should never have spoken about them at all." That Christians soon after the Apostles' times began to talk of their clergy as priests and Levites, shows (he adds) how strongly men were bent towards such notions, and therefore makes the silence of the Apostles the more remarkable.*

Now, contrast this with the teaching of the revered Bishop of Salisbury, W. K. Hamilton. In his last *Charge* (1867) he speaks of his clergy and addresses them, as priests.† Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper he says: "I speak of that Sacrament as a sacrifice.‡ . . . The original words of which 'Do this' is a translation, mean

* Second Edition, 1854, pp. 39 and 41.

† Fourth Edition, 1875, p. 49. ‡ p. 38.

in Alexandrian Greek, 'Sacrifice this;' and the other word *ἀνάμνησις* is also a sacrificial word."* "I answer without hesitation that our Church witnesses that through consecration the Body and Blood become really present; and by this I mean 'present without us,' and not only 'in the soul of the devout receiver;' or, to use words very familiar to you, 'the Body and Blood are present *objectivé* and not *subjectivé* only.'†

4.

Easy as it would be to multiply similar instances of conflicting doctrine, I leave them alone, in order to call attention to two special cases which illustrate most forcibly the point at issue, viz., that the Church of England has ceased to have any regard to doctrine, *qua* positive truth. The first is the Gorham Case. Its special importance in this connection is this, that it was the first legalising of the principle that varieties of the faith have a legitimate place in the national Church; and the portentous damage which the admission has produced, quite apart from the particular dogma denied by Mr. Gorham, is to be seen in the heterogeneous character of Anglican teaching as it is exhibited to-day.

The case in question touched one of the Sacraments; touched one of the Articles of the Creed. Mr. Gorham denied the regeneration of every child in Baptism; and the highest Court for ecclesiastical purposes, to which either he or his opponents could appeal, decided in his favour. As a consequence the denial, equally with the affirmation of baptismal regeneration, has all the sanction that law can give it. The doctrine may be affirmed in one parish and denied in the parish ad-

* p. 42.

† *Ibid.*, p. 61. I may add, further, that this *Charge* was no sooner delivered than ninety clergy of the diocese formally controverted the teaching of their Bishop in a protest addressed to their "common ecclesiastical superior," the Archbishop of Canterbury.

joining. Even in one and the same church, it is affirmed by the present incumbent, it is denied after his death, and it is reaffirmed again by the next pastor in succession. All this under the authority of this Church and realm, all this as the Church's expression of the truth ! As a result, the parishioners presided over by these successive teachers, instead of being fed with positive truth, are reared in a system of actual doubt ; and "the flock dispute in divisions, each under the authority of the Church, until they make their peace in disbelieving both members of the contradiction."* To quote the words of one † whom the judgment drove into the Catholic Church, "To those who believe truth to be Divine, that the authority of God is in every article of faith, and that our contradictions are His dishonour, it inspires alarm to hear from such authorities that the late sentence has not touched the doctrine of the Church. Would the legalising of Arianism after the Nicene Council, leaving the Nicene Creed to stand in words, have touched the doctrine of the Church ? Would legalising Sabelianism touch doctrine so long as the words of our formularies are unchanged ? If the answer be Yes, I ask Why ? The formularies are still unaltered : the faithful may still teach the Nicene doctrine."

The difficulty which is experienced in arguing on such points with members of the Church of England is the want of anything like common principles to start from. The ideas of the Church and of the faith in the minds of the two are fundamentally different. When I point out to my Anglican friends the varieties of teaching in the Church of England, I am met with the reply, "Oh, but in

* Letter to the Bishop of Chichester, by H. E. Manning, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester, 1850, p. 36.

† *Ibid.*, p. 37.

all fixed and essential* points there is no contradiction !” But, what about Baptism ? If the doctrine of Baptism be not a fixed doctrine, then there is no such thing in the Church ; if the doctrine of Baptism be not essential, then nothing is essential. It is unnecessary to refer to other disputed points : this one suffices. The true doctrine may now be preached almost universally, as it never was before ; but as long as there be one of the Church of England’s pastors teaching the heresy instead of the faith and teaching it uncondemned, the Church that tolerates the false side by side with the true is self-committed to heretical doctrine.

Where will you find a parallel to this in the Church of Rome ? From the Orkneys to the New Hebrides, where will you find Catholick pastors giving conflicting testimony on any one Article of the Creed, or on the doctrine of any one Sacrament ? Where in the Catholick Church will you find, from Hymenæus and Alexander downwards, an instance of a heretic that the Church did not expel from her bosom if he repented not ? The expulsion of the false is every whit as vital to the being of the Church as the retention of the true ; and the total inability of the national Church to purge itself of its own false teachers is only one of the many tokens of its non-inheritance in the Body of Christ. For the power of the keys has not failed. Dr. Döllinger, historian and theologian, accepts every point of the Catholick faith but one ; yet, for rejecting the one, he is excommunicated. What his belief may be at the present hour it would be hard to say, seeing that within four years of his fall he openly denied the Tridentine doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Rosmini, an eminent writer on theology and philosophy,

* The Catholic Church knows no such distinctions as essential and unessential doctrines in matters of faith. Nor, indeed, does the Russian. See Palmer’s *Visit to the Russian Church*, pp. 353 and 359.

and the founder of a special Congregation in the Church of Rome, is shown, mainly from his posthumous works, to have controverted the faith. Did the writer's death absolve the Holy See from the task of condemning his erroneous teaching? Not at all: no more than the Church was relieved in the sixth century from anathematising the writings of Theodore and Theodoret because their authors had lain a century in their graves. The errors were not dead. Accordingly, by a Decree of December 14th, 1887, forty propositions, taken from Rosmini's works, were "indisputably condemned," and the Pope now writes (June, 1889) insisting that all further discussion of the question be at an end.

5.

The other case to which I referred is that of Dr. Colenso, whose history, even more than Mr. Gorham's, shows Anglican zeal for the truth in a most pitiable light. Is the Church of England the champion of inspiration of Scripture? Yet Colenso attacked both authority and inspiration. Does the Church of England reverence the Bible as the Word of God? Yet Colenso rejected large portions of it as human and fictitious. Does the Church of England believe the Godhead of Our Lord? Yet Colenso denied it; and for such crimes was formally separated from the peace and communion of the South African branch of the Church of England by the greater excommunication. Lastly, how does the Church of England regard its own ecclesiastical sentences?

This last question cannot be treated quite so briefly, and the answer is to be found in the following facts. In 1867 the first Pan-Anglican Synod assembled, at a time when the Colenso trouble was at fever-heat. He was still in possession of his Episcopal office, title, and revenues, as though no sentence of deposition had been delivered. Indeed—what was worse—the spiritual judg-

ment had been pronounced null and void by the civil, and his accusers were compelled to pay the deposed Bishop his income (and arrears), unless they would proceed against him for heresy : and this they declined to do. The situation was, in short, the scandal of the hour, and demanded instant redress. Yet although it was a burning question, and (I suppose) because it was a burning question, the Synod, as a Synod, refused to enter officially into the merits of the case. It did not even go so far as to confirm the South African sentence ; and a resolution condemning Colenso, moved by the chief American Bishop present, was ruled out of order.

At the Synod of 1878, the whole subject was studiously avoided. But the year following, the question was reopened by the act of the Bishop of Worcester sending a message of " God-speed " to Colenso, and thus making himself a partaker in Colenso's evil deeds. The excitement which this incident produced in the Anglican world was for a time intense. It was felt, and felt very justly, that the Church of England itself was compromised in the person of the Bishop of Worcester, unless his action was at once disavowed : and the admission that his recognition of Colenso was based upon the sentence of the secular Court seemed only an aggravation of the offence.

To repudiate the act in a way more or less indicative of the Anglican Communion at large, was not easy ; though, to their honour be it said, many of the Low Church party were as much shocked by the occurrence as their High Church brethren. Then there was the question of a place and occasion worthy of the demonstration. *Faute de mieux*, an approaching meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was eventually seized by the aggrieved Churchmen in order to deliver their protest against the scandal in a large and significant way.

But (alas, for the hopes of the orthodox !) it all came

to nothing. It was represented to the excited and indignant assembly by the presiding Bishop, that in the present sub-divided state of the Church of England the funds of the Society would be seriously imperilled, and subscribers alienated, if anything like a censure were pronounced, or eminent persons reflected upon. He recommended, therefore, the previous question.

Such is the national Church's regard for the truth ! Such her zeal for the faith delivered to the Saints ! Such is her reverence and respect for her own sentences ! Stabbed in a most vital part—the validity of her own spiritual censures—she refuses to staunch the wound, out of respect for the feelings of eminent personages and private friends, and a question of so many pounds, shillings, and pence ! The supernatural powers claimed by the Church of England, as acting and speaking in the name of Our Lord, seem to be an oppressive and awkward subject ; and having been once employed had better now be silently dismissed and the whole matter forgotten.

Thus ended this incident, so characteristic in every detail of the Church of England, and so typically illustrative of the poisonous Erastianism which is paralysing every department of her being. How well I remember it all ! It is nigh on ten years ago now : yet the hot flush of shame almost comes back to my face to-day, as I see again the lackeys betraying and bartering away their Christ for these miserable pieces of silver.

With this I bring to an end the consideration of these two cases. They have a strict connection with each other ; the Colenso case being only the orderly consequence of the Gorham precedent. The earlier case admitted the fatal principle of a double-sounding doctrine, and gave it a legitimate place in the Establishment ;

and the latter showed the working of the principle, and the entire inability of the Church to expel the poison from its system.

There is one pertinent question arising out of the above. It is this : How comes it that the Church of England has lost its disciplinary powers ? I suggest the answer : that in tampering with the faith it has forfeited the authority which a firm grasp of the faith can alone secure. But that is not the only reason.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRINCIPLE OF COMPREHENSION.

Hoc est quod schismata apud hæreticos fere non sunt : quia quum sint, non parent. Schisma est unitas ipsis. Mentior si non etiam a regulis suis variant inter se. TERT. *de Præscr.* 42.

It is, of course, absurd to suppose that the Church should be held responsible for all and every ignorant and erroneous statement where no point of faith is involved, or where error is censured as soon as it is detected. But when it is not censured? When, on the contrary, the false teaching is repeated and persisted in; as-severated both in the pulpit and in the press? When the teachers themselves continue to officiate in the Church, and live and die in her communion, unadmonished, uncensured, unexpelled—is not the case altered at once? Is not the Church that communicates with such teachers itself compromised? To hold the faith, in any real sense of the words, is not only to teach the true, but to condemn the false. To tolerate both side by side, is not to hold the faith but to part with it.

I.

When the Donatists charged the Church with tolerating evil livers within her fold, St. Augustine opposed to them

the parable of the tares ; but he also bade them look at home. He instanced one of their own members, the notorious Optatus, called, for his ruffianly extravagances, the "Pest of Africa." "Isn't Optatus," he asked, "enough, according to your theory, to infect and compromise any Church ? Yet you are in communion with him !" If St. Augustine could use this retort when no point of faith was in question, what would he say when the faith itself is construed in opposite senses by clergy of a community claiming to be part of the Catholick Church ?

Take the doctrine of the Eucharist as taught by the Bishop of Lincoln and by the (Protestant) Bishop of Liverpool ; the Divinity of Our Lord, as taught by Canon Liddon and by Canon Fremantle ; the doctrine of everlasting punishment, as taught by Dr. Pusey and by Dr. Farrar ; Episcopacy, as taught by Mr. Gore and by Dr. Hatch ; the inspiration of Scripture, as taught by Dr. Christopher Wordsworth and by Mr. Haweis. Of these pairs of conflicting teachings one may be orthodox, but it is utterly impossible that both can be. One may be true, but the other must be false, must be heresy ; if heresy be *contra fidem, contra dogmata, contra veritatem*. Yet the Church of England tolerates both classes of teachers, is in communion with both, includes and continues to include both within its fold without sign of censure, or expostulation, or even of alarm.

This most shocking anomaly it was that constituted the chief poison of the Gorham judgment, and that followed from that judgment as a natural and immediate consequence. The mischief then was in embryo, but the fatalness of the principle was only too evident ; and against it Dr. Pusey and those who acted with him at the time protested most strenuously. In the set of Resolutions which they published on the occasion,

it was solemnly declared that "the Church will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby." To accept the judgment, they asserted, would be for the Church to abandon an Article of the Creed ; and in so doing to forfeit its office as teacher and to deprive its members of assurance of grace in the Sacraments. Even more than this. They expressed their conviction, "that by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act," the Church of England "becomes formally separated from the Catholick Body."*

How Dr. Pusey managed to reconcile his continued connection with the national Church with these Resolutions staring him in the face I cannot pretend to say. For the remedial measures which he then demanded in order to avert such awful consequences were never once applied. Nor to this hour has the heresy been repudiated. The Church of England has neither "openly and expressly rejected the erroneous doctrine," nor authoritatively re-affirmed the true. On the contrary, it has ended by adopting that epoch-making judgment as its own ; and "the lawfulness of holding contradictory expositions" of articles of faith—against which the Resolutions of 1850 protested—has now developed into a well-recognised principle of the Anglican polity.

And so the process of disintegration goes on. The most august and transcendent verities, the Atonement, the Godhead of Our Lord, the Incarnation—are none of them spared by the advanced guard of Anglican criticism. Each, in turn, is passed under review ; is stripped of the excessive scholasticism or superstition which deformed it ; and the true doctrine re-stated in a shape more in harmony with rational religion. Thus Mr. Haweis † re-

* See the Resolutions in Pusey's *Royal Supremacy*, 1850, p. 227.

† *Thoughts on the Times*, pp. 184—188.

states the doctrine of the Trinity in a sense practically not distinguishable from the heresy of Sabellius, and still officiates under the licence of the Bishop of London. The Rev. the Hon. W. H. Fremantle, in the *Contemporary Review* of July, 1878, in an article on the "Future of Judaism," is prepared to throw overboard such unessential matters as the Divinity of Our Lord, the Atonement, and the Trinity, in order to please the Jews. Four years later he is appointed to a Canonry in Canterbury Cathedral. What is the character of his more mature sentiments may be gathered from a paper of his in the *Fortnightly* of March, 1887 ("Theology under its changed conditions"), and from the reply to it by the late Dean of Chichester, in which the Dean charges the writer with "denying every Article of the Creed."

2.

This shows one exactly what value to set upon the retention of the Creeds by the Church of England as an argument for its orthodoxy. It is not, as everyone must allow, the retention or even the recital of Creeds, but the meaning which the Articles of the Creed are made to bear, that shows what is the Church's real doctrine. The interpretation, moreover, which has to be judged, is not that of Pearson, or Bull, or Waterland, but the living expositions of her living teachers.

How then can the use of the Creeds be appealed to by the Church of England, as the Lambeth Conference appeals to them, as though it were the smallest proof that she held the true faith? Is it not most patent that formularies in themselves are powerless to check false doctrine? *Ecce signum!* The notorious books which naturally shock devout and faithful Anglicans are written by men who, Sunday after Sunday, recite the Creeds publicly and officially in church. The Athanasian Creed is not, I believe, ever read in Mr. Haweis' church; but

he has expressed his perfect willingness to do so if required by the Bishop, and then to refute it, clause by clause, in the pulpit afterwards.

In short, it has come to this, that anything may now be taught in the pulpits of the Church of England, or in the published writings of her divines; and, in explanation of the phenomenon, and as some sort of apology for doctrinal contrariety, three theories have been started.

There is first the view of the late Archbishop Tait, that sermons (and, I suppose, books) are only "private opinions, which no hearer is bound to accept without questioning the statements therein propounded."*

There is a second theory, mentioned to me by an Oxford professor of theology, that the erroneous teachings of a Bishop or clergyman are to be regarded in the light one might view the mistakes of a general on the field of battle: like Rupert's mistake, for instance, at Naseby, in squandering his first advantage and so losing the day. The comparison is certainly ingenious; but, if it is to describe the state of things actually existing in the national Church, it must represent the Prince not only losing the battle by fatal misadventure, but tearing up the King's commission and going over to Cromwell and Fairfax: for the faith is, admittedly, denied.

But there is a third theory, and a much bolder one. Instead of disowning or excusing these contradictory creeds, it accepts and, as it were, consecrates them. Just as it was left for the present century to formulate the principle of development in the Catholick Church, so has it been reserved for this generation to introduce a property into the idea of the Anglican Communion which should

* *Church of the Future* (Charge for 1880), pp. 129, 130. Just conceive a Catholick Bishop saying this *ex cathedrâ*, as Archbishop Tait does in this instance, of the sermons of his own clergy!

most accurately discriminate her character. It is the property or principle of Comprehension. The conception of the term is, I believe, due to Bishop Wilberforce, though it matters little with whom the word originated. But the idea itself was little less than a stroke of genius, and belonged deservedly to the age of inventions.

For see what it amounted to! What difficulties it solved, what inconsistencies and contradictions it explained! It covered at once the whole field of diversity of belief within the kingdom. It showed that all the mutual antagonisms of parties and schools were but the due expression of the Church's coextensiveness with the religious thought of the country. Besides, it was in perfect accord with the spirit of compromise which asserts itself in the Preface to the Prayer Book, and which may be recognised, again and again, in the ambiguous statements of its formularies and articles.

It even gave a new meaning to the vexed and venerable name of Catholick. Whereas antiquity had interpreted the word to mean Everywhere one; or, Holding the faith in its entirety; or, Teaching all necessary truths; or, From one end of the earth to the other; or, Communicating with the nations—the Church of England enlarged the signification of the term. She appealed to the multiplicity of views which found a shelter within her elastic framework, and caught them to her bosom as so many precious pledges of her true Catholicity of sentiment.

This is much, but it does not exhaust the gifts which the comprehensive principle has to bestow upon the Church which adopts it. It has one more blessing in its grant—a basis for Christian reunion; in which mutually destructive creeds should form no unimportant factors in the way of charity and peace, and the whole movement appear to be directed by the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth. In short, to quote Tertullian (who comes in

most appropriately at this point of the argument), "They huddle up a peace with all everywhere. For it maketh no matter to them, although they hold different doctrines, so long as they conspire together in siege against the one thing, truth."*

3.

If, then, the comprehensive theory has been forced upon the Church of England, it is not from any partial or temporary affinity that it may possess with her system, but on account of its complete correspondence with phenomena exhibited all along the line of her history from the first, down to the state of conflict and division at present prevailing within her fold. And I shall only be appealing to the fountain-heads of authority, if I cite the teaching of the last two Archbishops of Canterbury upon this important point.

The present Archbishop, in his address to the Synod of 1888, dwells particularly on this note of the Anglican Church. He calls attention to "the manifoldness, the embracingness, the comprehensiveness, and the integrity of the Church's spirit;"† and sees in these tokens a direct realisation of the original plan of Augustine, the Apostle of England.

Later on‡ are pointed out the blessings which comprehension may be expected to produce :

Tremblingly, yet rejoicingly, we do believe that new charities may blossom from our differences. The attitude of an opponent now is almost always an attitude of respect. The asperities of the present are almost milder than the forbearance of the past. Affection between advocates of mutually destructive views is no unreal or unwonted thing. If rougher tests of progress are of value, much more is the prevalence of a spirit which makes characteristic diversities not merely tend towards truce, but lean lovingly towards unity. For this, beyond question, is the working of the Spirit of Christ.

* *De Præscr. Hær.* 41. † *Lambeth Conference.* S. P. C. K., 1889, p. 40. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

Archbishop Tait's language, though not so beautiful as his successor's, is much more circumstantial. For example, on comprehensiveness of doctrine, he says :* "The Church of England, though not undogmatic, is very wide in its comprehension of various private views as to the doctrine of the Sacraments, and in this peculiarity it keeps near to Holy Scripture." On comprehensiveness of Communion, it is shown how closely the English Church is united, at least in principle, with "the great Protestant Communities throughout the world, Episcopal and non-Episcopal, which adhere to the Apostolick faith."†

I am not given to the use of italics, and capitals, and notes of exclamation, and such like typographic signalling; but if ever they were excusable they are here. I am obliged, therefore, to pause a moment in order to call attention to an Archbishop of Canterbury, first of all saddling Holy Scripture with the ambiguities of Anglican sacramental teaching; and, secondly, maintaining that a religious body can reject Episcopacy, and yet adhere to the faith of the Apostles.

Now I go on: because these are not the only marks that the Archbishop has to bring forward recommending the Church of England to the envy of mankind. Her comprehensiveness is not limited to English-speaking congregations, whether in Great Britain or in the United States. So far from this, Lambeth is represented‡ as becoming "more and more every year a centre for all the Churches of Christendom which protest against Roman usurpation." An enumeration of these centripetal Com-munions is, accordingly, given :—**schisms in France, schisms in Holland, schisms in Germany, schisms in Mexico; the Nestorian heresy, the Coptic and Armenian

* *The Church of the Future* (Diocesan Charge for 1880), p. 129.

† *Ibid.*, p. 13. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 2. ** pp. 4—13.

Monophysites, the Scandinavian Church, the Bulgarian, the Orthodox, the Greek—all and every apostasy from Catholick unity is represented as being received with open arms by the successor of St. Augustine, and as contributing to enhance the dignity of the Church of Canterbury.

4.

Now, in order to show how utterly unscrupulous the Church of England has become under her present ambitious *régime* as regards anything like principle, anything like keeping faith with original declarations, provided she can obtain a semblance of recognition by Communions older than herself,—I will take her recent attitude towards Eastern Christians, “the great divisions of the Greek Church,” as Archbishop Tait calls them. “With these,” he says, “we have growing relations;” * and correspondence with Orthodox Bishops and visits of stray Oriental dignitaries to this country are paraded before the public as a sort of token of the Church of England’s inheritance in the *Orbis terrarum*.

Parenthetically, I am bound to admit that when we come to examine the existing relations between England and the East, or the progress actually made in the direction of reunion, they fade away to the most intangible results. The Encyclical of Lambeth (1888) on this head speaks officially (and oracularly) as follows: “Individuals (*i.e.*, individual Orientals, *Si quis inter Orientales*) craving fuller light and stronger spiritual life may, by remaining in the Church of their baptism, become centres of enlightenment to their own people.”

Here is wisdom : and mistiness, says Cardinal Newman, is the mother of it. But I do not think that I ever so thoroughly realised the fact as in contemplating this truly

* *Ibid.*, p. 6.

marvellous deliverance. I wonder to myself as I read it whether the Oriental is able to make anything more of it than I can. I can only suppose that the words contain some deep though veiled meaning, and that pending more definite terms of procedure it is just as well not to commit oneself too far.

Yet, on the general question; one would imagine that going by its own declared principles, the national Church ought to have as much and as little relation with Greek Christians as light has communion with darkness, or Christ with Belial. What is Anglicanism bound to disavow with every fibre of its being if it be not Transubstantiation; and, if there be another doctrine more abhorrent still, the Mediation and Invocation of Saints? As all the world knows, these doctrines are fond things vainly invented, blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits. Yet nothing is more certain than that the Oriental Communion, towards which Anglicanism is now reaching forth the hand of fellowship, hold and teach and exemplify these beliefs, and would as soon think of denying them as of denying Baptism, or the Seven Sacraments, or the Blessed Trinity, or the Worship of Images.

On Transubstantiation, "the standard of Eastern doctrine," says the Rev. J. H. Blunt,* is to be found in the *Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholick and Apostolick Church of the East* (A.D. 1643). Quæstio lvi. of the Confession says:

Our Lord is also present upon earth in a sacramental manner by Transubstantiation (κατὰ μετουσίωσιν), since the substance (οὐσία) of the bread is changed into the substance of His Holy Body, and the substance of the wine into the substance of His Precious Blood.

**Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, 1871, p. 760.

As if this were not plain enough, the Council of Bethlehem (in 1672) declares in its Canon xvii. :

After consecration, the bread and wine are transmuted, transubstantiated, converted, transformed (*μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιούσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι*), the bread into the Lord's Body which was born at Bethlehem, *etc.*, and the wine into the Blood which flowed from his side upon the Cross.

Further, lest any should think that, according to Eastern doctrine, the whole Christ (*totus Christus*) was not contained under one species, note what follows :

And that the bread and wine no longer remain after consecration, but only the very Body and Blood of the Lord, under the appearance and form, that is to say, under the accidents of bread ; and that the Body and Blood of Christ are received into the mouth and stomach of the evil and the faithful, but that the accidents only are broken, Christ being wholly and ever under each portion.

The Tridentine definition is certainly not more explicit than this ; and, indeed, confines itself to the use of fewer terms in asserting the conversion of the substance of the *materia sacramenti*. It was, in fact, the special protest and anathema of the East against the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies, which by this time* had evacuated the Protestant conception of the Eucharist of almost every particle of Catholick doctrine.

As to the Invocation of Saints and the supreme mediatorial office of Our Lady held by the Greeks—well, it is hardly necessary to insist, or to multiply instances.

Cardinal Newman has already tabulated numerous examples † of the kind, showing the bold and unfettered character of Oriental devotion towards the Mother of God. Where we end our prayers, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord," we find the Greek supplicating again and

* 1643 and 1672 A.D. † Letter to Dr. Pusey, 1866, pp. 148 *seq.*

again, "Have mercy on us through the Theotokos;" "Help, save, pity, preserve us, O God, through her, the All Holy, Immaculate;" "Pardon at the intercession of Thy all holy Mother and all the Saints;" "By thy mediation, Virgin, I am saved."

All this, too, not in manuals of popular devotion, but in the ecclesiastical books, in the horologies, and euchologies, and liturgies of Orthodox, Jacobite, and Nestorian. In fact, Dr. Overbeck, himself a member of the Russian Church, dwells upon "the gratifying contrast" presented by Orthodox doctrine, "with the tame style and subdued voice of the Romish teaching in the Council of Trent."* His own formularies are, as he points out, infinitely bolder in their addresses to the Holy Virgin. "Thou art the *salvation* † of the Christian race," "the *only help* of man!" exclaim these exuberant votaries. "Intercede for us and *have mercy upon us!*" "Consent, O Immaculate, to *save* thy servants!" "By thy compassion, O Lady, *heal and deliver* those who are sick!" "Most Holy Lady, *have mercy on us!*" "We all *fall down before thee*: by thy mighty protection *save us all!*" "Mary, *purify* us!"

Well may Renaudot say, ‡ "No one has accused the Orientals of deficiency in the legitimate honours which are the right of the Deipara; but many have charged them with having been sometimes extravagant in that devotion, and running into superstitions, which accusation is not without foundation."

* *Catholic Orthodoxy*, 1866, p. 45.

† This and the following are quoted by Dr. Overbeck (*Catholic Orthodoxy*, 1866, pp. 46, 47, and *Orthodox Catholic Review*, vol. i. pp. 252, 253) from the *Ευχολόγιον τὸ μέγα* Venice, 1862. The italicised words in these suffrages are, it should be noted, underlined by Dr. Overbeck himself *in l.*, not by me.

‡ *Liturg. Orient.* I, p. 237, qu. by Cardinal Newman.

5.

Here, then, are the Communion to which the Church of England is now making advances in order to procure a quasi-recognition of its Catholicity. In the Lambeth Synod of 1867, and again, in less forcible terms, in 1878, a protest was entered against "the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as mediator in the place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayers to her as intercessor between God and man."

Wiser in its generation, the Conference of 1888 makes no such objections, nor hints for a moment at any Grecian errors, but "reflects with thankfulness that there exist no bars" (to communion with Orientals), "such as are presented to communion with the Latins." On the contrary, "the Conference has expressed its earnest desire to confirm and improve the friendly relations which now exist between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion;" and it testifies to "the light of the Gospel," which they have "kept alive in many a dark place."

It is such a real mercy to find Anglican doctrine saying anything definitely or drawing the line anywhere, that this passage in the Encyclical rises into unusual importance. It appears, then, that there are "bars" beyond which the Church of England will not and cannot advance, and which absolutely block the way to reunion—the decrees, namely, of the Immaculate Conception and of Papal Infallibility: but that no such obstacles present themselves in the way of communion with the East.

That is to say, the doctrine that the second Eve was, at least, as divinely preserved from original sin as the first Eve, is a positive bar to the fulfilment of Our Lord's prayer for unity: but Transubstantiation, when it is Grecised into *μετουσιώσις*, is none.

That the Church should, by the Divine promise and providence be continuously preserved from error by a living infallible voice, is not a blessing, but a sort of curse in the Anglican view of it, and a fixed bar to reunion: but to address our Lord's Mother in terms usually appropriated to the Deity, is little or no obstacle at all. And what is, at best, soul-destroying error if taught in the exact and restricted terminology of the Catholick Church, turns into "Gospel light" when it is expressed in the rhapsodical utterances of the separated East.

What, I only ask, would St. John with his one doctrine, and one alone; what would St. Paul, who bids us all speak the same thing and hold the truth in love; what would they say to these flattering overtures and these "friendly relations" between Church and Church, based not on any agreement in the faith, but on a mutual compromise of religious principles?

There is only one conclusion that any unprejudiced person can draw from these facts, and that is that positive truth is absolutely immaterial to the Church of England. A truce is all that she aims at now: whether within her walls or outside of them. A rigid uniformity might have been necessary in the earlier years of her history, but it is manifestly inconsistent with the march of learning of to-day. Let us have toleration of every shade of religious opinion within the circle of the national Church! Let us extend our charity and our recognition to other Communities even more fundamentally separated from us! Lambeth shall be more and more the focus of religious comprehension and compromise, the rallying-ground of a universal Protestantism, and the Church of the future!

6.

But, to this assemblage of all the denominations under the wing of England, there is one notable exception.

One Church is conspicuously absent, to which no advances are made, no friendly relations improved, no terms of communion proposed—the Church and See of Rome. This is all the more remarkable, because, early in those ages which the Church of England considers peculiarly her own, communion with this See was regarded not only desirable, but even of moral necessity for those that would be orthodox. “With this Church,” says a Saint* and Martyr who had heard Polycarp talk of St. John, “with this Church, on account of her more powerful headship, every Church, that is to say, the faithful on every side, are bound to agree.”

And if union with the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul was believed to be a test of orthodoxy in the second century, is it less a paramount duty now? Now, when all religious thought outside of her is in flux and change, shifting and sliding from day to day, do you think that the Church of the Rock has less to offer to the sons of men, less peace, less certitude than in the days of her martyrs?

It was, then, no gratuitous and unfounded assertion that I made at starting, that the Church of England is regardless of truth. I was not exaggerating in saying that unity of faith is no longer material to her. Where is the doctrine of Christ, where the form of sound words, where the unvarying tradition of the Apostles? It is gone: as completely vanished and departed as the golden glory of the sunset of yesterday.

If the toleration of opposite teaching in a Church means anything, it means that the Church is indifferent to positive truth. It means that the one doctrine is as good as the other, though the difference between the two is merely the difference between being saved and perishing everlastingly. Yet, though the most conscientious of

* *Irenæus cont. Hæres.* 3, 3, 3.

English Churchmen accept the premisses I have just stated, they ignore the ominous judgment which these premisses pronounce upon the morality, and even the existence of Anglicanism viewed as a Church. They recognise the evil, but not with alarm. "We of the English Church" says Dr. Liddon,* "are already unable to assert before Christendom that we practically hold even serious doctrinal differences to be a bar to religious communion. We co-operate with those who deny that which we deem true, or assert that which we deem false."

Less than two years before his death, Dr. Pusey thus describes the evil days on which his old age had fallen: "It is a strange conflict. Every matter of faith is openly denied. The being of Almighty God is denied by His creatures, and doctrines which are the centre of Christian faith, such as the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord, are claimed to be open questions. It is said to be an anachronism that clergymen should think themselves bound to cease to minister in the Church of England because they no longer hold those blessed truths. A clergyman may preach to his people that there is no hell, and so encourage them in the vices which God condemns."†

Such is the picture which not I, but two of the most revered names in the Church of England give of her present condition; and nothing that has been advanced in these pages is so absolutely damning of her claims to be considered the *Ecclesia Docens*, as the admissions of these Anglican divines. That they should grieve over these fundamental differences of doctrine is only natural. But what is remarkable is that they should not see that the tolerated existence of such a state of things, is a palpable sign that Anglicanism is not merely in a critical

* Report of Bonn Conference, 1874 (Preface).

† Letter in *Church Times*, December 10th, 1880.

condition, but has ceased in any true sense to be a Church at all.

People will not face the facts. They know that the Church, if it is to exist at all, must be the voice of the truth of God, and that the message must be one. Yet they do not see that a so-called Church, which delivers a contradictory message and which includes truth and untruth side by side, has virtually signed away its existence. Even as I write these words, I know perfectly well that those who read them will read them perhaps in anger at the writer, but with no concern for their own safety while they continue members of the national Church.

This is, indeed, the alarming feature of Anglicanism, the absence of all alarm: the acquiescence in such complete negations of the truth, as though truth had ceased to be of the Church's essence. And if two such venerated divines as these I have mentioned,—the very watchmen and conscience of the Church of England,—are content with this ostrich-attitude in the face of the scandal, what hope is there of the community at large?

What anxiety is felt, seems to be less that an article of faith should be contradicted by heretical teachers, than that a decision of the Privy Council should by them be contravened. This, the late Archbishop of Canterbury plainly showed when, as Bishop of London, he was appealed to in 1867 to take notice of some startling tenets (the Real Presence, Eucharistic Sacrifice and Adoration) then just enunciated by certain clergy in an address to the Primate. "However erroneous," he wrote*, "the opinions in question may be, and (so far as I can comprehend them) are in my judgment, it has never been decided that it is penal in a clergyman of the Church of England to hold and announce them." The

* Letter in the *Record* of August 14th, 1867.

whole force of the Bishop's answer lies in the word "penal." With the view of discouraging prosecution, he shows that the false teachers were within the four corners of the law as it then stood, and would be proceeded against with difficulty. But that the faith should be perverted where no point of law was involved, was a matter which need give Bishops of the national Church little or no concern. It was only the normal condition of things.

7.

But there is another unity besides that of belief, the Unity of Fellowship. There is the One Body as there is the One Faith. The one is every whit as essential, both to the being of a Church and to the salvation of the individual as the other, as English Churchmen should be well aware. They know, as well as I, that if there be one doctrine which has pre-eminently the seal upon it of having been taught "everywhere, always, and by all," it is the doctrine of the indissoluble Oneness of the mystical Body of Christ. "For this reason," says St. Ambrose, "shall the reign of the Church endure for ever, because the Faith is undivided and the Body one."*

In enumerating the fundamental principles of the Church, the Apostle mentions One Body, and he places it first, before all the rest.† This he does purposely, lest the children of men should rashly conclude that they might be partakers of all the rest, while they neglected the unity of the Body upon which the rest depend. And, now, how are Christians who are separated from the See of St. Peter, going to justify their isolation? What bars in the way of reunion can they conscientiously allege, which do not apply with tenfold force to their actual communion with notorious heresy? The old arguments based on the possession of the truth is lost to

* In *Lucan* lib. vii. n. 91.

† Eph. iv. 4.

them. Anglicanism is manifestly, openly, cryingly regardless of unity of doctrine. It has lost the One Faith, just as it has lost the One Body. It has lost the One Faith, because it has lost the One Body.

It is hardly possible that this state of things can continue. It is hardly possible that intelligent and conscientious men can go on trusting to a religious body, as pillar of the truth, which has lost all power of saying what is the true doctrine, or of condemning those who deprave it. And I do most solemnly declare, on my conscience, that I would sooner that heresy and falsehood were taught, so they were taught uniformly, unvaryingly, and by authority, than an immoral system which says and unsays, affirms and denies one and the same doctrine in the words of its ambiguous formularies and in the teachings of its variously-believing ministers ; and that holds nothing so firmly or so certainly as to make the contradictory of the proposition the condemnation of those who maintain it.

Such unscrupulousness as this in mere matters of ordinary dealing between man and man would involve a high degree of moral turpitude ; but when it becomes the character of a religious body, pretending to the office of the *Ecclesia Docens*, one would sooner not discuss the matter. It is the *corruptio optimi*—and there one must leave it.

CHAPTER V.

THE CURE OF SOULS.

O ineffectual and vain tradition ! To exhort to penitence, and to take away all healing power. It is to shut up the way to repentance, by our hardness and cruelty in intercepting the fruit of repentance.—ST. CYPRIAN, Ep. 55, 24.

THE subject which is indicated in the above heading had so considerable a weight in determining my steps to the Church of Christ, that it is incumbent on me, however briefly, to refer to the matter.

I.

Professedly, the Church of England has souls to train in the discipline and correction of the Lord, so that they may glorify God in this world, and not fail of everlasting bliss in the world to come. This it has to do not with angels, but with men : with human frailty of all kinds and in all ranks of life, from the time of childhood upwards.

The opening years of the child have to be watched over, and the initial seeds of baptismal grace diligently fostered and tended. With this view a systematic spiritual education must be taken in hand : the training in the love of God, the imitation of the Christian virtues and the conquest of the opposite vices, the practice of

good works, teaching by the examples of the Saints, remedies for venial faults, preservatives against sin. Add to these, habits of prayer, special forms of devotion, regular attendance at Divine worship and the catechisings and instructions of the pastor of the parish.

To do this effectually, the personal agency and influence of teachers specially devoted to this work is required. The teachers are brought into daily and hourly contact with their charges. They occupy towards them for the time the *locum parentis*: not only teaching, but supervising, watching, protecting from harm the tender plant of the nascent Christian life.

This, it may be said, is an ideal system of education; but it is nothing less than what the Catholick Church orders for her children, where free scope and adequate provision for action is within her means.

2.

When, however, we come to contrast with this the Anglican system, it must be allowed that the latter has much to learn from Roman practice. Its text-books for religious education are the Bible and the Church Catechism. The former, in the absence of any authorised commentary, may be and generally is interpreted according to the teacher's own theological bias: while the Catechism, as a manual of moral theology and as an exposition of the necessary heads of Christian doctrine, must in all conscience be pronounced to be meagre and inadequate enough.

According to Christian theology, Baptism is followed immediately by the lessons of Baptism and by the moulding of the baptismal life, which will certainly fade and wither unless made the subject of careful nurture from the beginning. But in the Church of England, the Baptism once administered, the duties which arise from that Sacrament are in the majority of cases practically left

to take care of themselves. A long interval, from infancy to incipient manhood and beyond it, ensues, during which the young Christian receives the modicum of religious teaching a Government school permits, eked out by such supplemental instruction as can be given on Sunday.

After this long exposure to the world's influences, it is trusted to pick up the dropped threads at Confirmation and in the opportunity for direct spiritual dealing which is then afforded. But the weeks of the Confirmation Class do not last for ever, and with them all further individual direction comes to an end, so far as the ministrations of the Church are concerned. From that moment, except in the case of sickness, what private and personal contact has the Church of England clergyman with the members of his flock until he commits them to the grave?

3.

This leads to the inquiry how the Church of England deals with post-baptismal sin. The answer will be found in the Catechism and Holy Communion Service, and in the requirements prescribed before approaching that holy Sacrament. According to the Catechism, these are self-examination, repentance, and faith; to which may be added (from the Communion Service) confession to Almighty God, and the option of confession to a clergyman in exceptional cases.

Such is the letter of the Prayer Book: it remains to see what is the practice and what the machinery and medicines for the cure of mortal sins.

Shall I be saying too much if I affirm that, as a physician of souls, the Anglican Church has no medicines to apply to so mortal a disease: or else, that having them she refuses to dispense them, and throws the whole work and responsibility of the treatment upon the poor sinner himself?

At least, let those who dispute the statement consider if the directions given in the exhortation before Holy Communion do not amount to as much. Private self-examination, and immediate confession to Almighty God : none of the humiliation of confession to God's minister, and no absolution or satisfaction following, being anywhere laid down as pre-requisites towards worthy reception.

4.

If this is not the Church's teaching, it is most certainly its practice. It is not necessary to refer to Episcopal Charges and Pastorals and Manifestos and Declarations to show that the "Priest in Absolution" has no place in the working system of the Established Church. As a Church it has instinctively retired from so sacred and mysterious an office. Something, perhaps, should be conceded to the honesty to which this attitude is due ; but what is the result ? The result—supposing Anglican orders to be valid—of permitting sacrilegious communions to be made at its altars. The result, not only of permitting, but in the case of officials (clergy, clerks, choir-men, and others), of necessitating frequent receptions of Holy Communion in a state of mortal sin.

Now, I ask anybody if this be not, in the proper sense of the words, an awful and horrible thing ? And if we go further and seek the cause of it : if we contrast the spiritual provision enjoyed by every Christian man, woman, and child in England four hundred years ago, with the total abeyance of such ministrations in the Anglican and Nonconformist England of to-day—to what shall we ascribe the difference ? To what, indeed, is the difference due if it be not to the teaching of the Reformation and the Prayer Book, that the Sacrament of Penance is a corrupt following of the Apostles, and that every man is his own absolver ?

It may, of course, happen in Catholick churches that

a person may present himself at the altar and be communicated once or twice or even more, without his identity being known : and it is therefore possible for a Catholic to receive Communion without previous confession. But he knows that in so doing he is adding sacrilege to his other sins. It is not, as in the Anglican Communion, for any lack of proper provision for the case, but in direct neglect of the provision which the Church not only offers, but enjoins.

The Church of England rightly insists on the necessity of Communion, and on the peril of unworthy reception—and then, with the most marvellous inconsequence, closes the door upon the only means known for attaining the desired end. “If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come”—I think the man has reason on his side so long as the services of the priest are practically denied him. As a result, he is left to wallow all the more deeply in his sins ; not merely because absolution is withheld, but because he is deprived of the proper help in the work itself of repentance.

5.

And in the much larger category of those who never communicate, the vast multitude committed to the Church of England’s official charge, that is found rarely or never within its walls—is it not the same ? Souls going through life steadily, rapidly ; with weeks, and months, and years of accumulated and accumulating sin, rushing out at last into the presence of the Judge—

Unhouselled, disappointed, unaneled,
No reckoning made, but sent to their account
With all their imperfections on their heads !

People ask : What was it that took you to Rome ? Was it craving for infallible teaching ? Was it admiration of the magic of authority ? Was it the attraction

of solemn ceremonial? Was it to unite yourself with Saints, and doctors, and confessors who had been before but a wonder and a name? Was it in order to become at once one with all that mighty, world-wide host of believers and workers in all nations, tongues, and languages?

Truly, the reasons which draw men to the Church of Jesus Christ are many, and many her points of contact with human needs and aspirations; and, putting other reasons aside, it would seem to be enough to have a hearty belief in the forgiveness of sins, and to seek the Lord's absolving power where there could be no possible doubt as to its effectual exercise.

This is what I felt to be so grievously and painfully lacking in the Church of England. With her voice she kept calling those around her to lead a godly, righteous, and sober life; but the motive and the power to implant it had gone out of her. She seemed to me to be sent to a few—to the righteous, and the refined, and the educated: but when it came to dealing with sin and with calling sinners to repentance, the cunning of her hand forsook her. Her preaching, and her warnings, and her invitations, earnest and solemn and heartfelt though they were, failed for lack of their individual application in the one medicine provided by Our Lord for the purpose.

Therefore it is that, refusing to give immediate guidance to the soul, and drawing back from the griefs which her children would have poured into her ear; and disdaining to know the secrets of the prison-house and the real condition of those committed to her care; and for lack of such knowledge, being unable to judge the case—she is obliged to tolerate the evil which she cannot cure, and to treat the secret sin as though it existed not and the secret sinner as though he were righteous. And what will ye do in the end thereof?

Sacerdotes ejus contempserunt legem meam, et polluerunt sanctuaria mea: inter sanctum et profanum non habuerunt distantiam: et inter pollutum et mundum non intellexerunt: et a sabbatis meis averterunt oculos suos, et coinquinabar in medio eorum (Ezech. xxii. 26.)

CHAPTER VI.

THE CATHOLICK NAME.

O si eos caritas potius quam animositas superaret ! Inde victores fierent, unde victi essent. Nos autem Ecclesiam Catholicam, ad cuius pacem et concordiam et reconciliationem invitamus inimicos ejus, non humanis opinionibus sed divinis testimoniis amamus, tenemus, et defendimus.—ST. AUGUSTINE, *Sermon* 358, 1.

BUT there is a further argument for distrusting the Anglican Body, and for passing over to the Roman obedience ; an argument, common and trite almost to the extent of banality, yet rescued from mere commonplaceness both by the high names that have not disdained to employ it, and by its literalness of application at the present hour to separatists from the Apostolick See. The argument is the name of Catholick, and the entire failure of any religious body to appropriate the name outside of the Church of Rome.

I.

My difficulty, then, was this : that believing the Church of England to be an integral portion of the Universal Church, nowhere did I find it recognised as Catholick. By none was it spoken of, thought of under that designation. The world, little as it cared for such questions, had, I found, a decided and, indeed, unanimous opinion

as to the meaning of the title. It had no manner of doubt which religion it denoted, and when occasion served, not only used the term, but unhesitatingly and instinctively identified it with a particular religious body. But it was not the Church of England.

However, I said to myself, what does it matter what the world says? The Church will always have the world as its foe. The world's estimate of things will always be at odds with that of the Church. The Church has to overcome the world. She must assert herself in the face of the world, and re-affirm what is ignorantly denied.

I wished, then, to see the Church of England boldly proclaiming her right to the name of Catholick. What simpler, grander title? It was the Church's special possession. What more legitimate, then, than her use of it, and what more distinctive of her character amid all the Comus-rabble of many-headed Protestantism? To claim it, to use it, to appropriate it, established at once the portion of England in the One Body of Christ. Really, it almost amounted to a solution of the whole question in dispute, and that of the simplest, briefest, and most practical sort.

Most earnestly, then, did I desire to see the Anglican Body rising to a full sense of her privileges. I wished to see her openly, boldly calling her schools, her colleges, her societies and institutions of all kinds, her organs in the Press, her publications, her churches and her members by the name of Catholick. Why did she hesitate? The name was ancient, most ancient; Apostolick even. Why did she not use it?

Ah, why indeed? To my sorrow I found that she could not. Not only did the world refuse her the title, but she dared not herself assume the name. She prays in the Prayer Book for the Catholick Church, she confesses in the Creeds the same, but the words sound

strangely upon her lips. For any meaning they may have, they seem to be spoken of some other than herself. Her own connection with, her own identification with that Church of which she speaks, is nowhere laid down or explained in her formularies; and the most evident and practical method of asserting them she deliberately retreats from.

2.

I asked myself in despair why this was so. I asked others. I asked two of highest office in the Church of England, and the answer which was given me represents more or less the way in which the difficulty is met.

The reason, then, that the Bishop gave for not making a general use of the name was its liability to be misunderstood. The Church of Rome had so abused the word by an exclusive use of it, that it precluded us for the present from employing the term without fear of misconception. But he himself used it freely wherever he could when speaking of the faith, or ritual, or ministry, or members of the Church of England. No reasonable being, he added, could doubt which was the true Catholick Church or the real Catholick hierarchy in this country. No one could seriously regard the Roman establishment in the kingdom, as other than schismatic or intrusive: no one, who knew anything of history, could be ignorant of the wholly modern origin of the Roman Communion in England.

With this I had to be content. It did not remove the difficulty I felt. The fact remained. If I called myself a Catholick, I had my own word for it: but the world refused me the title; and I began to see that the world was right.* It was but another application of Cardinal Newman's rule: the world's verdict was not to be gainsayed. I had after all been fighting against facts;

* Human testimony, says Butler, remains still a natural ground of assent: and this assent, a natural principle of action. Pt. II., c. vii.

confirmed not only by the weakness of friends and the insistence of foes, but by the impartial judgment of the nations.

Indeed, it was impossible seriously to be satisfied with the partial and localised Catholicity necessitated by the Anglican theory, and with an orthodoxy determined by considerations of nationality or territorial boundaries. The nearest approach to it is found in Judaism: but certainly Judaism does not present such a series of contradictions and anomalies as Anglo-Catholicity: as though citizenship in the earthly state was to be the precise measure and analogy of Christian membership in the *Civitas Dei*.

3.

I know few things more curious than the use of the word in the mouths of English Churchmen. The very name itself becomes an awkward thing to manage, a sword that turns its point against those who rashly presume to handle what is not their own.

Conceive for instance the claim to the exclusive possession, in England at least, of a title which the claimant—even in England itself—dare not assert! Was there ever an apter illustration of the Dog in the Manger? According to the Tractarian theory every individual Churchman is a Catholick: and therefore the (Protestant) Bishop of Liverpool is a Catholick. But no one could maintain such a thing except in jest; and the High-Churchman himself would be the first to deny it. When used by him with concrete application, the word Catholick denotes the priests, churches, ritual and teaching of the advanced section of the Church of England, and it means nothing more. To such infinitesimal proportions is this magnificent and distinctive name at last reduced, and upon such slight grounds is it refused to the millions in communion with St. Peter's See!

But why this refusal? Why grant the point and in the next breath resist it? I wish to shew how unreasoning it is. It goes clean against their own admissions. They allow that members of the Church of Rome are Catholicks, only not exclusively. Be it so : then if we are Catholicks, exclusively or not, we are entitled to the name. No possible reflection, one way or the other, is implied in your yielding to another a name which he has in common with yourself. If I call the crossing-sweeper at the corner an Englishman, I do not deny my own nationality : if I call myself so, I do not deny his. So is it certainly with this great and distinctive title which all that are Catholick enjoy in common, and which each possesses in full without damage to his fellow-members' rights. The simplest laws of language and of reasoning oblige as much. Therefore not to conform to this rule is not only singular, but suspicious : for never, since Christians began to be so designated, was it ever heard of a Catholick who refused the name to another. The man might be his friend, or his bitterest foe : he might be a good Catholick or a bad one : but he could no more deny him the possession of the name, than he could deny him the possession of a pair of legs or a nose in the middle of his face. It is no question of opinion but of fact.

So then if English Churchmen are Catholicks, as they assert, they will assuredly give us their brother-Catholicks the name ; and any hesitation to do so, much more refusal, is on this hypothesis simply inexplicable. But if they are not Catholics, and therefore assuming a title which is not rightly theirs—then the inexplicable is explained. The hesitation, the sensitiveness on the subject, the avoidance of the word, the difficulty experienced in using it, and the refusal to give it to those to whom the world accords it, is at once understood. "Christian is my name," says St. Pacian, "Catholick is my surname.

The former gives me a name: the latter distinguishes me. Therefore our people when named Catholick are separated by this appellation from the heretical name"—and who in the world, I should like to know, is willing to ticket himself heretic ?

4.

The difficulty in managing the name, which I have alluded to, will have been observed in any Anglican version of English history, especially as the Reformation period is approached. Our fathers, whether English or Norman, who fought at Hastings, are good and simple Catholicks; those who fought at Crecy shew already the taint of Roman Catholicism: while those who fought at Flodden blossom out into pure and unmistakeable Papists. After Elizabeth's accession the name, for some unaccountable reason, disappears altogether.

Or let me put the question: What was the religion that went out under Edward, that came in again with Mary, and went out finally under Elizabeth? Was it Catholick or Roman Catholick? To call it Catholick would be to call its dispossessor heretical. To call it Roman Catholick would be to imply that the old religion of the country was the religion of Rome. Here's a pretty state of things! Again, was Sir Thomas More Catholick or Roman Catholick? He cannot be a Catholick, for he died for the Papal supremacy; yet to call him Roman Catholick is almost worse, since it represents our forefathers as being till then in the Pope's communion. Take the modern use of the name. An Anglican is a Catholick, not a Roman Catholick: I am a Roman Catholick, not a Catholick. Or rather it is this, so finely must the distinctions be drawn: I am a Romanist so long as I remain in England: if I go to France (not to Holland) I become

a Catholick : and I return to Romanism as soon as I set foot once more in Kent.

Nay, it is possible, incumbent even, to push Tractarian principles to perfectly legitimate, yet more paradoxical conclusions still. The Church in Spain, the Church in France, in Italy, in Austria, *etc.*, is, according to the strict High Church theory, the true Church of Christ in those countries. Consequently it teaches true doctrine. Consequently Papal Infallibility is true, transubstantiation is true, the supremacy of the Pope, the mediation of saints, purgatory, indulgences, the sacrifice of the Mass, are all true doctrines. That is to say, they are true and they are not true. They are true in Belgium, false in Holland. They represent orthodoxy on one side of the Channel, heresy on the other.

5.

Now is not this palpably absurd ? I have endeavoured throughout these pages to avoid stating the argument in any way that might give needless offence to English Churchmen ; and if what I have just written appear manifestly ridiculous, who is to blame ? I am only seriously applying principles seriously laid down by members of the Church of England themselves. I do not say that they seriously believe them, for I am well aware that the Anglican position required us to maintain much that we did not seriously believe at all. We did not even understand them.

My Anglican friends are very angry with me when I bid them treat the question seriously, and not trifle with words and names of solemn import. Well, I must endure their anger, and I make my appeal to the world. Here is a case in point (one out of many)—this name of Catholick, a name of solemn and most significant meaning. It is and always has been one of the marks of the Church of Christ

which no stranger could assume ; a token given to her by the providence of Almighty God, so that the Church of His only begotten Son should by this name alone—were there no other evidence—be distinguished from all those rival Christian bodies which resemble Her, but are not Herself. It is thus designed to be a constant guide to the wanderer, warning him of error and pointing the way to Him Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Now, to frustrate this design of Heaven seems to be the set purpose of the Church of England of to-day, endeavouring with all the means at its command to cancel and obscure a sign that should be most manifest to all the world. It is as though a man should wantonly extinguish the faithful fires that are set up on perilous coasts to guard the seaman from wreck. For the Anglican destroys this beacon-light of the Church, and cruelly (oh ! most cruelly) erects no guiding lamp of his own instead ; and if I call this playing and trifling with sacred things, I consider that I am only using the most moderate and forbearing of language.

But, after all, what I am aiming at is not to anger either friend or foe, but to press home, if I may, the difficulty and confusion in which the Churchman will become entangled as soon as he begins to act upon his assumed Catholicity.

For myself, when I think of the dialectical maze into which the Anglican theory leads the unsuspecting enquirer, as compared with the simplicity of the Catholick Church : when I think of the refinements and distinctions, the provisos and qualifications, the checks and the counter-checks that have to be carefully observed on this side and on that, so as to state the Catholicity and continuity of the National Church in anything like logical shape, and at the same time steer the whole argument clear of Rome—I am amazed to think that I should ever have accepted

it for half-an-hour as an adequate solution of the problem.

The labyrinthine anfractuositities of the position, as Dr. Johnson would doubtless call them, remind me of a remark made by one of the characters in George Eliot's novel of *Felix Holt*. It is where Dredge and old Sleek and a number of colliers from the New Pits are assembled at Chubb's; while Transome's election agent, the glib-tongued Mr. Johnson of Bedford Row, is endeavouring to explain to his public-house audience the precise shades of difference between the Whigs whom he was opposing, and the new "Liberals" of the Reform Bill, whose cause he was instructed to advocate. But the delicate *nuances* of the London attorney were somewhat beyond the appreciation of the Sproxtton pitmen. "Its wriggling work," said Dredge, "like follering a stoat. It makes a man dry. I'd as lief hear preaching, on'y there's nought to be got by 't. I shouldn't know which end I stood on if it wasn't for the tickets and the treatin'."

6.

I now give the passages from those Saints who have drawn an argument in favour of the Church from the point raised in this chapter. Oft quoted, oft repeated, they may still do service again, since the testimony which they bear will never lose its application or its cogency. The interest which attaches to them lies in the witness which they bear to the peculiar title distinguishing the Church of Jesus Christ—even in those early days—from the various Christian denominations which disputed her claims and attempted to affect her prerogatives. St. Cyril, of Jerusalem (A.D. 347), in explaining the article of the Creed, says:—

Since the word church or assembly is applied to different things—as it is written of the multitude in the theatre of the Ephesians, *And when he had thus spoken he dismissed the assembly*, and since one might

truly and properly say that there is a *church of the evil doers*, I mean the meetings of the heretics, the Marcionites, and Manichees and the rest—the Faith hath delivered to thee, by way of security, the article, “And in One, Holy, Catholick Church,” that thou mightest avoid their wretched meetings, and ever abide with the Holy Catholick Church in which thou art regenerated.

Then, more particularly, of Church buildings:—

And if ever thou art sojourning in any city, enquire not simply where the Lord’s house is (for the sects of the profane also make an attempt to call their own dens houses of the Lord), nor merely where the Church is, but where is the Catholick Church. For this is the peculiar name of this Holy Body, the mother of us all, the Spouse of Our Lord Jesus Christ. *Catechetical Lectures* Oxford Translation (Dr. Pusey) 1838, Lect. 18, 26.

St. Pacian (A.D. 347) writes more at length upon the same subject. In his letter *On the Catholick Name* to Sempronianus, the Novatian, he says:—

Suppose this very day I entered a populous city. When I had found Marcionites, Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatians and others of the kind who call themselves Christians, by what name should I recognise the congregation of my own people unless it were named Catholick? (Ep. I, 6). Christian is my name, Catholick is my surname. The former gives me a name, the latter distinguishes me. (*ibid.* 7.) Wherefore our people when named Catholick, are separated by this appellation from the heretical name (*ibid.* 8).

In his second letter he resumes the subject, maintains that the word is no “accessory” title, and goes on to say:—

Indeed I am glad that although you may have preferred others, yet you agree that the name attaches to us. What, should you deny? Nature would cry out. But, if you still have doubts, let us hold our peace. We will both be that which we shall be named, witness the antiquity of the name. Ask a century and all its years in succession whether this name has adhered to us: whether the people of Cyprian have ever been called other than Catholick (*i.e.* since 260 A.D.)

Further on he adds :—

In the meantime, tell me yourselves what you are called. Do you deny that Novatians are called from Novatian? Impose on them whatever name you like, that will ever adhere to them. . . . You will answer, Christian. But if I inquire the genus of the sect, you will not deny that it is Novatian. Confess it without deceit. There is no wickedness in the name. Why ashamed of the origin of your name? When you first wrote I thought you a Cataphrygian, *etc.*, Oxford translation, Pusey's *Library of the Fathers*, Ep. 2, 3, 4.

St. Augustine has two places bearing upon this point, he says :—

We must hold the Christian religion, and communion with that Church which is, and which is called, Catholick, not only by her own, but by all enemies. Whether they will or no, even heretics themselves and those that have been reared in schism, when they are talking not amongst themselves but with strangers, openly call the Catholick Church by the name of Catholick. For they would not be understood unless they distinguished her by that name by which she is called by the whole world. (*Vol. 1., 561, B. Ed. Ben.*)

And here is the second place from St. Augustine, the famous and, I may add, beautiful passage in which he gives the reasons “which most justly keep him in the bosom of the Church of Jesus Christ :”—

The agreement of peoples and nations keeps me there. Authority—begun in miracle, nurtured in hope, increased by charity and confirmed by antiquity—keeps me there. The succession of priests from the See itself of Peter (to whom the Lord committed the feeding of His sheep) down to the present Episcopate, keeps me there. Lastly, I am kept there by the very name of Catholick: which among so many heresies, that Church has, not without reason, alone held possession of. So much so, that though all heretics wish themselves to be called Catholick, yet when any stranger asks where the Catholick service is held, no one of them dares point to his own church or dwelling.

Rightly, then, do all these bonds of the Christian name—many and great and most cherished as they are

—rightly do they keep believers in the Catholick Church. Albeit the dullness of our understanding, or the character of our lives may be such as to prevent the truth manifesting itself at once in all its fulness. But with you, who have none of these tokens to invite or to retain me, all that there is, is but a sound of promised truth. And, if you could really demonstrate the truth so as to preclude all doubt, I should prefer it before all the reasons which keep me in the Catholick Church. But, if truth be only promised and not proved, then no one shall move me from that faith which attaches my mind with so many and strong bands to the Christian religion. (*Vol. viii. 110, D.E., Ed. Ben.*)

What I remark here is the extraordinary coincidence of this witness from the fourth century, with the state of things amongst us now. In the face of that accusation of error and that plea of truth urged then as now, St. Augustine gives as the reason, or rather one of the reasons that kept him a Catholick, the same that keeps us now—though it be cast in our teeth as a reproach—namely, the succession of Pontiffs in the Roman See down to the present Pontificate. The argument which both he and St. Cyril adduce in favour of the true Church of Christ, holds good with undiminished force at this very hour: no one has any doubt what particular place of worship is intended when the question is asked, Where is the Catholick service held? Lastly, this name that distinguishes a certain body of Christians and which none but they have ever been able to assume, is as distinctive, as exclusive, and as well known by the world at this moment as it was in the fourth century. I think then that I have a manifest right to an argument in token of the true Church, which I find employed by these Saints. I have a right to raise the question which I find raised in their pages. As Anglicanism entrenches itself behind the Fathers, I may fairly use the argument which the Fathers themselves employed, and ask the

Church of England in their name why she never calls herself or anything that is hers by this most ancient and distinctive title.

It was a worry, and a difficulty, and a grief, and an offence to me for years. Surely, I may now be permitted to pass on the question to those that I have left behind me. I ask them the question now : but not now for information, for I know the answer. It is because the Catholick name is the inalienable heritage of the people of God.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ISOLATION OF ENGLAND.

Respondete, quare vos separastis ? Quare contra orbem terrarum altare erexistis ? Quare non communicatis Ecclesiis quibus epistolas apostolicas missas tenetis et legitis, et secundum ipsas vos vivere dicitis ? Respondete, quare separastis ! *St. Augustine, de Bapt., 2, 6, 7.*

It would be curious to know—curious as to know the sensations of the soul as it loses its last contact with the body—when England awoke to the consciousness that she was severed from the body of Catholick Christianity. Her agreement with the faith of her fathers was broken in two, her communion with Churches beyond the seas ceased, and, above all, the bond that held her to the central see of Christendom was snapt and gone.

I.

I try to picture the time. The abbeys and religious houses were alienated or in ruin ; the religious Orders dispersed. Holy Mass had gone, and the altars were taken out of their places and made into paving-stones. Roods and images and crucifixes were burnt by the cartload at a time. Chalices were turned into drinking-cups, and sacred vestments converted into canopies and hangings for the chambers of merchants' wives or the parlours of knights' ladies.

The matins, lauds, and vespers of cathedral and collegiate churches came to an end, and the processions were gone, and dirge and morrow-mass and month's mind, and confession to the priest, and the sacraments at large.

The bishops had long gone, dead or dispossessed, and there were none in the land. By the end of Elizabeth's reign, certainly early in the next, the last even of the priests, for whose special benefit the Thirty-second Article had been devised, must have passed away in extreme age; and only a few could have remembered the ritual of the old religion ere it expired with Mary. Here and there some brave missionary was hiding in Holborn garret or remote Shropshire manor or northern town, shriving the few frightened recusants that knew of his retreat and ministering to them the Bread of Life. But for the bulk of the nation at large, all was over and gone. The desolating, devouring waters of Protestantism had come in and risen and spread abroad and covered the land and the people.

The Church that had baptized the Britons of the second century; that sent St. Ninian to Scotland in the fourth; that in the succeeding age evangelized the Irish by St. Palladius and St. Patrick, and reclaimed our own island from the Pelagian heresy by the mission of SS. Germanus and Lupus—was denounced as the Babylonical Beast of Rome, as Antichrist, and the mother of harlots and abominations. The faith of St. Gregory and St. Augustine, the Apostles of our own dear native land; the faith of St. Columba, St. Aidan, and St. Finan and the missionaries of the North, was laid under the ban. The religion of Venerable Bede, of Alfred, of St. Dunstan, and of the Confessor; the religion of Lanfranc, and St. Anselm, and St. Thomas; the religion of Langton, and Grosseteste, and Chicheley; of Chaucer and Ockham; of Warham and More and Fisher, was proscribed as blas-

phemous, idolatrous, and false. It was all gone, clean swept away and abolished as though it had never been.

2.

Such was the effect of what used to be called the glorious Reformation ; but, I fancy, this language is not used nowadays. It has come to be very much discounted. It is freely criticised by the majority of English Churchmen ; it is disliked heartily by the dominant section. When Lord Macaulay, the hostile critic of the Reformation, says that "the work was begun by Henry the murderer of his wives, continued by Somerset the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth the murderer of her guest"—the sentiment is applauded. When Mr. Froude, the faithful champion of the Reformers, writes : * "The Anglican hierarchy was the child of convulsion and compromise ; it drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and had Elizabeth's throne fallen, it would have crumbled into sand"—what have its children to reply ? They have nothing. Yet, what I remark is, that though the Reformation is thus generally discredited, it is acted upon as though it had been directly commanded from on High. Nothing less. Indeed, I don't see how any other line can be consistently taken by members of a Reformed Church. If the Reform of Luther were not heaven-directed—and all criticism so far tends to show that it was not—then the schism remains without excuse ; and as the separation is kept up, one can only conclude that the Divine Legation of the Reformer is still an integral portion of the reformed faith.

To be precise, however, there is a separation, and there is none. Towards the existing Catholick Church there is unquestionably a suspension of communion. But with regard to the pre-Reformation Church in this country, we

* Hist., Vol. vii., p. 174.

are invited to believe that no break whatever occurred—in faith, practice, or regimen—and that it is all one level and conterminous march of ground.

Just consider the following facts :—In January, 1559, Convocation drew up certain articles, affirming what the English Church had held ever since there had been a Church in the land. The articles were but few, and were addressed to the immediate matter before the country, viz., the doctrines of the Eucharist and the Mass, the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ, and the exclusive province of the spirituality in all matters relating to faith and discipline. The paper was entrusted to the Bishop of London and by the Bishop presented to the Lord Keeper, who received it politely enough but made no remark. By the middle of May the Sessions terminated, and the last Catholick Convocation that ever sat at Westminster came to an end.

Why Sir Nicholas Bacon made no remark upon the Articles of Convocation is pretty evident. He had other plans in hand. A month previously—previous, I mean, to the meeting of Convocation—*i.e.*, in December, 1558, another and very different document had been privately drawn up and handed to Secretary Cecil. Strype considers it to have been the composition of Sir Thomas Smith. It is significantly entitled * *The Devise for alteratione of religione at the ffirste yeare of Q. Elizabeth.* The first head of the proposal is, *When ye alteratione shalbe ffirste attempted?* The second, *What daungers maye ensewe uppon ye alteratione?* The fourth gives a draught list of names of persons fit to review Edward's prayerbook; and the seventh suggests *Sr Thomas Smythes lodgyng in Chanon Row* as a place of meeting.

I beg to call attention to these two remarkable contemporary documents, and particularly I beg the atten-

* Cotton MS. Julius F. vi. 167.

tion of those who are endeavouring to persuade themselves and others of the unbroken continuity of Anglicanism.

This precious *Devise for Alteratione of Religione* was no idle paper-scheme to be crumpled up in Mr. Secretary's hands and cast behind the fire. As the event shows, it prescribed the lines upon which the Revision of Elizabeth was in the event actually carried out. Early in 1559 a Committee was appointed, the persons named in the *Devise* were members of it; they met at Sir T. Smith's in Canon Row; and by the end of April their labours were finished, and the revised Prayerbook passed through Parliament.

Now what did this mean? It meant—neither more nor less—that the Mass of a thousand years and more was to cease. It meant that the religious action which is of the very life and essence of the Church, was to come to an end. For to suppose that the Catholick religion could continue, could even exist with the Mass cut out of it, is to suppose the impossible.

Yet, who has any sort of doubt that this was the intention of the founders of the Church of England? The very haste with which the thing was hurried on betrayed their purpose. The readings of the Bill for Uniformity were taken on April 18th, 19th, and 20th, 1559, and the new book of Common Prayer became law. The Holy Sacrifice was allowed to go on unrebuked till June 24th, after which it was to cease. It was made severely penal not only to offer the Mass after that date, but even to be present at It. The abolition of all altars necessarily followed; and directions for their removal and for the substitution in their stead of "a decent table for Holy Communion," figure in the first Visitation Articles of Archbishop Parker. The change was notified in tones of triumph by Parkhurst to his friend Bullinger at Zurich.

"The Pope," he writes, * "is again driven out of England, to the great regret of the Bishops and the whole tribe of Shavelings. The Mass is abolished."

But, write we never so truly, it all goes for nothing. Though every page of history, every witness friendly or unfriendly, every document we possess, every old church-building that remains—in short, though a whole chain of circumstantial evidence testifies to the removal of the old religion and the substitution of the new—yet it is all false. If history says so, history itself must be rewritten.

"Repeat, and repeat, and repeat," says† the Bishop of Southwell, that the Church of England never acknowledged any subjection to the Pope, never separated from Rome, never changed her doctrines at the Reformation; never rejected the Papal Supremacy, and is precisely the same Church now as before the sixteenth century. To teach otherwise, says the Bishop, is to teach a delusion.

Well, I repeat it as the Bishop requests, in order that others may know the sort of statements that are made to do duty in defence of the Established religion. But what can you say to such a man? It seems to me that a Church which claims the special title of "historic," might do worse than begin by studying a little ecclesiastical history.

3.

But consider the meaning of this step of Elizabeth and her advisers. It was, as the Archbishop of York said in his place in Parliament‡ to fly in the face of General Councils, and Canon Law, and the consent of Christian Princes. It was to abandon unity, and to leap out of

* Zurich Letters (No. xii.)

† *Nottinghamshire Guardian*, Oct., 1886.

‡ *Strype*, Ann. 1, 2, 400.

Peter's ship into the waters of schism, sects, and divisions. Whether the Archbishop's words have not been verified by the event, I will leave it for others to say.

But further ; all spiritual union and concord with the nations of the continent was cut off at a blow. With the Catholicks of the Netherlands, who had received the Gospel from our own S. Wilfrith and S. Willibrord, all Christian intercourse was suspended. All ecclesiastical relations with Germany, though to Devonshire she owed her great Apostle and Primate, S. Boniface, were brought to a close. From the far-famed monastery of Bangor, in county Down, S. Columbanus had passed in the sixth century into Eastern Gaul to revive the drooping discipline of the Church in the Vosges : his chief disciple, St. Gall, following him, to be revered in after ages as the Apostle of Switzerland. But with Switzerland, except with the heresies of Geneva, England was to have no further dealings. With Bavaria, to whom Ireland also had sent her martyr S. Kilian, and with Belgium, to whom she had sent her martyr, St. Livin, it was the same. To Sweden and the shores of the Baltic, Catholick missionaries had gone forth from our coasts, but henceforth those countries were to be to us as unregarded as the kingdoms of Prester John. Besides, there was the Gallican Church, which from the days of S. Germain onward had rendered us innumerable charitable offices, and with which there had been a constant interchange of spiritual relations—well, that great and glorious Church, so fruitful in saints, except as an enemy, was to be known to us no more.

4.

Now, I pause a moment to note the significance of this general break-up of Christian unity. Whether you praise the Reformation or blame it, this—and not Justification

by Faith—is the phenomenon that strikes the observer. In Germany, Holland, Switzerland—wherever the wave of the Lutheran revolution extended, it is the same story of religious strife and division ; and its effects have only become more marked by time. In 1559 the Bishop of Chester could already enumerate “34 sundrye sects of opynions, whereof never one agreeth with another, and all differ from the Catholike Church.”* In 1889 the 34 have increased to 241 denominations in England alone, hateful and hating one another. But that is not the question. The question is whether the great upheaval of the sixteenth century has upon it the evident marks of Divine Providence. The change effected was (and is) so radical, revolutionizing the traditions of fifteen hundred years, that nothing short of the delivery of a Newer Law and of a further and final Revelation could account for it. Has it then, I ask, the special marks that should distinguish such Another Gospel?

What is the mark distinguishing the Gospel of Jesus Christ? It is, Peace on earth to men of good will. He came not to destroy but to fulfil ; to fulfil those beautiful promises and predictions of old, and to gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.

Express it in what terms you will—Reunion, Reconciliation, the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace—this is the essential character of the Reformation and Revelation of Jesus Christ. One word sums it all up—Charity.

Tested by this criterion, how does the revolution of Luther stand? We are not so helpless as to be unable to form an estimate, (and a very correct estimate) of its moral character : the evidences are plain and unmistakable enough. The world has long ago appraised it, like any other human movement : and those who are

* Speech in Parliament, *Strype's Annals*, vol. I., pt. II, page 43.

required to believe that the movement is divine, are bound to demand whether it bear upon its face the evident marks of a divine appointment. If not, what have you to do with it? I speak not only to members of the Church of England, but to all who derive their existing religious status from the events of the sixteenth century. The marks of the gospel of Christ are unity and peace. The marks of the gospel of Luther are strife and division. Judge for yourselves.

5.

It is now three hundred and thirty years since England's final separation, and it has continued unaltered to this very hour. Anglicanism, as a Church, in this present year of grace is not an inch nearer to unity than it was in the year that Elizabeth ascended the throne. It has resuscitated itself with extraordinary energy: newly adorned its temples, its ritual and its ministers; increased its episcopate; pushed its offshoots and missions into distant parts of the globe; improved its machinery; multiplied its defences and apologies and literary organs; magnified its pretensions, asserted and reasserted its claims—but all this has not affected its character. Still it remains Anglicanism: the religion of a locality. The whole movement, wheresoever it may be found, is reducible to the same separatist principle; national, local, isolated; and without a token of recognition from the Catholick world around.

“The Church of England” says Montalembert,* “who has denied her mother, is rightly without a sister. She has broken the bond of unity and obedience. Let her therefore stand alone before the judgment seat of God and of man.” The verdict of the west finds its responsive echo in the east. “The English Church” says Dr.

* *Letter to a Member of the Camden Society*, 1844. p. 4. Liverpool.

Overbeck* of the Orthodox Church, "stands insulated, without any recognised Catholick sister-Church, disowned by the whole Catholick Church, unable to be controlled on the Catholick deposit of faith."

I can understand the arguments and position of the Reformers. Men who sincerely believed that Luther was divinely commissioned to give a new Revelation to mankind,† and who fought against the square cap and surplice as badges and shadows of Antichrist, were consistent. If any such exist in these days, they, too, are perfectly consistent. They are logically justified in maintaining the breach with Rome. But a large body of priests and people who have brought back lights and crucifixes, sacrificial vestments and incense, confession, Real Presence and Eucharistic Adoration; and are now trying to persuade their Bishops to allow the rest of the abominations of Popery—these are, it must be admitted, something worse than illogical in sticking at the point of unity. Almost every Catholick doctrine and usage they are prepared to receive except one: and that, the one point without which all the rest will profit them nothing.

The departed generation of clergymen were not so paradoxical. I know that they are now looked upon as benighted Protestants: but they had their virtues. They were gentlemen and scholars, with a dash of the man of the world (more or less) in their composition; diligent pastors of their flocks, and well known to everyone in their neighbourhood. I should say, also, that in point

* *Catholick Orthodoxy*, 1866, p. 28.

† "Ce Martin Luther," writes Lord Chesterfield to his godson, "étoit un moine Allemand, auteur de la reforme, c'est à dire de la Religion Protestante que nous professons actuellement. Mais vous me demandérez peut-être, qui est ce Pape. Je vous diray donc que c'est un vieux Fourbe, qui est Eveque de Rome, et qui dans les tems d'ignorance passoit pour infallible, et le Vicaire de Jesus Christ, mais à present on s'en moque." *Letters to his godson*, 1890, p. 46.

of common sense, and in intellectual and moral perception they were equal to the typical Anglican priest of 1890. (I hope I shall be forgiven if I say, in a little whisper to myself, that they were far superior.) Anyhow they were more logical. They did not hold all Roman doctrine with the exception of the one doctrine of unity.

For instance, when in 1867 the advanced High Church party addressed the Primate with a statement of (then) extreme doctrine, it was enough to shock the minds of such older-fashioned clergy as I am referring to. I find the incumbent of St. Peter's, Hammersmith, the Rev. W. G. Cookesley, applying to his Diocesan on the subject; and pronouncing the doctrines in question to be not subordinate, but "fundamental, essential, vital," and the very grounds of the separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome. "If," he adds, "the doctrines propounded in this address are really the doctrines of the Church of England, she ought to join the Church of Rome forthwith. She is guilty of schism so long as she refuses to do so."

As he himself could not accept the doctrines alluded to, the writer goes on to state that, should they be declared by competent authority to be the real teaching of the Church of England, he must resign his office. He concludes, "It is wholly inconsistent with the idea, much more with the maintenance of a National Established Church, that the clergymen who teach the doctrines set forth in this address, and clergymen who hold such doctrines to be absolutely false, should be permitted to teach and administer in the same Church."*

I am told that in leaving the Church of England I am guilty of gross disloyalty. But to what? Not to the grand idea of Catholicism, not to the principle of unity, not to the plain teaching of Scripture, nor to creeds,

* See the Correspondence in the *Record*, August 14th, 1867.

nor to history. Still less was I unfaithful to principles dear not only to Protestantism but to humanity; I was not untrue to the judgment that God had given me, nor to conscience, nor to matured convictions. Loyalty to Anglicanism when it is well considered means loyalty to the principle of separation : and if I shook off an allegiance of this description, who shall blame me ?

Some people nowadays speak as if the Church of England had resigned her office and no longer bore any message to the world. I don't believe it. She bears witness still. But the doctrine which she enforces is not the denial of the Mass or of the Invocation of Saints, nor Predestination, nor Communion in both kinds, nor the marriage of Priests, nor any of the dogmas of which she is supposed to be the accredited mouthpiece to mankind. The one principle which throughout all her vicissitudes she has never failed to preach is the principle of separation and, if I must add another, of disobedience. Though she close her lips, her very existence proclaims it. Like Tyre of old, the new Tyre of the West cries out, "I am a God and sit in the chair of God, in the heart of the sea !" and the legend inscribed upon her banner is the old motto of the rebellious angel, *Non serviam*.

6.

One asks, how is it to end ? What is the aim and aspiration of the leading spirits of the Church of England ? Is this to be the be-all and the end-all of the hopes of Churchmen ? Contented acquiescence in such a state of things one would hardly imagine to be possible ; yet contented acquiescence seems, as far as one may judge, to be the prevailing sentiment. The isolation, so far from filling hearts with dismay, is (alas ! that it should be said !) accepted as the inevitable and even made a principle. The Anglican is to be true to the idea of his church, and

that idea is separation. His religion is mainly to be inspired by loyalty to his own communion and to a cause supposed to be bound up with his allegiance to the Crown. Insular as is the national character, we must go to the National Church to get it in its most highly sublimated form. The idea of Catholicity is as entirely lacking to it as the idea of colour to the blind. Nationality takes its place. Being itself a disconnected body, it desires to detach others; and its *beau idéal* is an assemblage of local and particular churches, in which (to reverse exactly the teaching of the apostle) there should be Jew and Greek and Barbarian and Scythian—Roman, Greek, Russian, Gallican, and Anglican: each independent and acephalous and all dissentient in Christ Jesus!

But this is not to work the works of God. "Behold," says the evangelical prophet, "I will take the children of Israel from the midst of the nations whither they are gone; and I will gather them on every side and will bring them unto their own land; and I will make them One Nation in the land on the mountains of Israel and One King shall be King over them all; and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they any more be divided into two kingdoms." Ezech. xxxvii. 21, 22.

In these words lies the whole difference between the Catholick and Protestant principles, and the entire condemnation of the principle of division. The Divine plan exchanged the National Church which It had appointed for the Universal: the Anglican plan is to reduce the Universal back to the national again. That gathers the many into one; this is for disintegrating the one into the many. By the ordinance of God the several members are compacted together in one Body: and the device of man is how to resolve the Divine unity into its fractional parts. But by so much as the Church of England is bent upon this scheme of division—of

which it is itself a conspicuous example—by so much assuredly is it resisting the ordinance of God, and scattering instead of gathering, and doing the works not of the Lord but of His adversary.

7.

Observe, also, that the isolation within which England has chosen to entrench itself is absolutely fatal to the pretensions which it is now advancing. It claims the style of Catholick, and is at the same time in a state of separation—a proposition that contradicts itself in the mere stating of it. Here, in the England of Victoria, as in the Africa of St. Augustine, the question resolves itself to this one point—which is the Church of Christ in this country? Then, the controversy lay between the Catholick and the Donatist: now it is between the Catholick and the Anglican. Then, the world judged, and the verdict of the world prevailed. It refused recognition to a so-called Church which had no relations with the rest of Christianity. The touchstone was that of Catholick communion. *Ecclesia quæ non communicat cum gentibus, non est Ecclesia Christi*: the Church that does not communicate with the nations of Christendom is not the Church of Christ.

Tried by this test, England fails entirely to substantiate the title she is claiming. She has not nor has had for centuries, any spiritual fellowship with the nations with which she was once united in the bonds of peace. But, obvious and damaging as is the inference, it concludes nothing by reason of England's inaction and unconcern. Did she in any way seek a settlement or even an examination of her case, there would be hope. But she stirs not. It is not merely a separation, but a separation that is fixed. What is the reason?

There must be reasons: and, considering the irresistible testimony of Scripture alone on the point of

unity, the reasons must be transcendently great that render reunion not only not achieved, but even unattempted.

One would imagine there were physical, I had almost said geographical causes operating against it: as in the first evangelization of the regions within the Arctic circle, where communication was rare and sometimes impossible, and where the Pope's Bulls allowed a liberal margin of time for their arrival and publication.

But let us make the conditions harder than this. The Channel which divides us from the Continent may be crossed at furthest in a few hours. Suppose, in imagination, the strait widened a hundredfold to leagues upon leagues of perilous seas. Tell the intrepid mariner whose course was bent for these islands that he must first traverse a belt of storms: that after the storm he must enter a zone of fire: that after the lightning he would then encounter a barrier of floe and berg and ice fields, engirdling the land in its frozen ring. Yet even these obstacles would be no obstacle to Christian faith and charity. In short, unless we imagine Anglicanism banished to the moon, it is difficult to place her action, or rather her inaction intelligibly before the world. Because the moment that union is practicable, that moment is it imperative, according to the most elementary principles of ecclesiastical antiquity.

But no, it is not this. Something colder and more repellent than barrier of ice and more estranging than the estranging sea, is the pride and the unlove with which Anglicanism has walled itself round against those who should be brethren in Christ Jesus. These it is that sunder those who should be one; these, and the consciousness of a lost cause. They are not put forward, I know. Another plea is alleged, the traditional plea of Truth, which is advanced as the ostensible justification of

the schism, as though the whole Anglican position might be effectually covered by this single word.

8.

As I have already discussed this point at length, I will only stop here to notice a particular consideration of it—the pure assumption, namely, upon which the whole argument rests. It is assumed that the Catholick Church is in error. It is assumed that the Church of England knows and holds the orthodox doctrine.

I would only suggest that it is within the limits of possibility that the assumption itself may be false. Many old charges, *e.g.*, that of idolatry, are no longer urged because they are known now to have rested not on a knowledge of the Church's real teaching, but on a popular misconception of it. Is it not possible that the remaining accusations may be similarly ill-founded? It is so easy to imagine because we have the Scriptures before us in our own language, that therefore we know their real import. There it is, as plain as words can make it, chapter and verse, place after place, plainly opposed to this or that doctrine of Rome! And while we are thus reasoning, we may profitably bethink ourselves that every bitterest Dissenter is saying precisely the same with reference to Anglican teaching. From the same Bible and from the very same version of it, he finds what he imagines to be the most convincing reasons for opposition to the Established religion. The appeal to Scripture is, therefore, useless. Nothing comes of it either way; and as St. Augustine and St. Hilary remind us, it has been the special snare of heretics from the beginning.

But further: these doctrines—part true, part false—are held and taught not in one nation or country, but in many, all over the world. They are taught and believed by the Church in Spain, by the Church in Poland, in Ireland, in

France, etc.; and the message—part true, part false—is homogeneous, uniform, and one. Either, then, we must suppose all these bishops, priests, and peoples slavishly submitting, generation after generation of them, to teach and maintain at the Pope's bidding what they know well to be heresy; or we must accuse their intelligence, and conclude that Protestantism alone has the gift of discerning the true Apostolick tradition.

According to Scripture, the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity dwells in and with the Church as the Informing Teaching Spirit, to guide it perpetually in the truth; and the doctrine thus taught must necessarily be one and invariable. In the Church which is Catholick and Roman this uniformity, even as its enemies admit, is literally the case. But, upon Anglican theories of Church Unity, we are compelled to believe that the Holy Ghost teaches one thing in one part of the Church, and another in another, and both as the expression of the truth of God!

Besides, considering that what binds all the Churches of the Roman communion together is their unity of belief, is it in accordance with common sense, much less is it in accordance with the ways of Providence, to imagine that from such an amalgam of truth and error as is supposed, there should result unity? Nor only so, but such a triumphant and unbroken unity as cannot be paralleled in the world! Surely, if its basis were the mixture of truth and heresy which its enemies assert, instead of lasting for nineteen centuries, it could not have lasted for nineteen days!

The argument is not mine but Tertullian's, and here are his words* :—

Is it probable (he asks) that so many Churches and so great should have erred into one and the same faith? Never is there the same result among many chances.

* De Præscr. Hær. 42.

The errors in the doctrine of the Churches must needs have produced varied results. But where one and the same thing is found amongst many, this is not error, but tradition. And will anyone dare assert that those (*i.e.* the Apostles) from whom the tradition first came, were themselves in error?

In whatever way the errors crept in (he goes on in an ironical strain,) error, I suppose, reigned so long as there were no heresies (to correct it)! Truth waited for the Marcionites and Valentinians to set it free! In the meantime the Gospel was wrongly preached and men wrongly believed; so many millions were wrongly baptized; so many works of faith wrongly wrought; so many miracles and gifts wrongly put in operation; so many priesthoods and ministries wrongly executed; finally so many martyrdoms wrongly crowned!

The shapes of heresy are many; its principle is one: it ever affects the defence of the truth which it destroys. In the second century it charged the Church with error, and in the sixteenth it accuses the same Church with having "erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." All that we need, then, is to apply the second century argument once more. We reply with Tertullian: "Error, then, I suppose, prevailed because there was no heresy to put it to flight. All were mistaken; and 'the whole of Christendom was drowned in abominable idolatry for the space of eight hundred years or more,' because Luther and Calvin had not arisen to set truth free and teach the pure Gospel to mankind!"

But the height of absurdity is only reached when the discrimination of truth and error is pretended by the National Church. Is zeal for the truth the distinguishing feature of that communion? Is it Anglicanism that is to teach the world what is true and what is false? Anglicanism, that does not know its own mind, that cannot lay down with certainty the precise meaning of a single doctrine? Anglicanism, that tolerates conflicting and

contradictory teachings within its own fold? Anglicanism, that says and unsays ; that affirms that there is a sacrificing priesthood and that there is none : that Christ is present in the Eucharist, and that He is absent ; that baptism regenerates and that it does not ; that confession is indispensable, that confession is unnecessary, that confession is optional, that confession is permissible, that confession is abominable and of the devil ?

I ask what the world, or the more sober and serious part of it, thinks of a pretension to orthodoxy that can show no clearer tokens than these. Unless the affirmation and the denial of the same point be its logical expression, it is difficult to see how the National Church can adjudicate on the question of truth, or plead it any longer as the ground of separation. And when this plea is removed, what other remains ? Indeed, there is none. Admittedly this is the one solitary defence ; and we are left with the spectacle of the Church of England prolonging a wanton and un-Christlike schism that has long lost even the semblance of an excuse.

9.

Yet the meaningless cry of Truth and Error is repeated, and the isolation is maintained. It is the one distinctive thing left to the National Church. All uniformity of teaching has been abandoned as impossible ; all precise definition of doctrine has been given up ; the rule of antiquity is left behind, and the principles of the Reformation itself called in question. One thing alone remains—the resistance of English Christians to their own Patriarch, and their hatred of the Church and See from which they received the Gospel.

If you trace this attitude to its historical source, you will find it in the exchange of a spiritual rule for a secular, and the transfer to Cæsar of the things that belong unto

God. The effects are evident at this very hour. The hand of the State still lays its chill heavy weight upon the National Church, paralysing and enslaving what should be free—its life, its liberty and its truth. Juda is gone into captivity because of affliction and because of great servitude. It is even so; and after a captivity not of seventy years but of more than three centuries, her banishment and her subjection remain the same.

Quomodo sedet sola civitas! How is she solitary that once was the fruitful mother of Saints, the Missionary of the heathen, and the Apostle of nations! She, the child of Rome and the devoted handmaid of the Holy See! How is she solitary and forsaken, that once joined hand to hand with her fellow-members in other realms! How is she alone now, a desolation and an astonishment and a rebuke; sundered from Christendom on every side; with no Catholick sister to symbolise with, none to communicate with, none with whom to interchange the holy offices of a common faith; knit together with none in the bonds of peace, but unknit in uncharity, and none regardeth it!

10.

Quomodo sedet sola civitas plena populo? Facta est quasi vidua domina gentium: princeps provinciarum facta est sub tributo.

Plorans ploravit in nocte, et lacrymæ ejus in maxillis ejus: non est qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris ejus: omnes amici ejus spreverunt eam, et facti sunt ei inimici.

Migravit Judas propter afflictionem et multitudinem servitutis: habitavit inter gentes, nec invenit requiem: omnes persecutores ejus apprehenderunt eam inter angustias.

Viæ Sion lugent, eo quod non sint, qui veniant ad solemnitatem: omnes portæ ejus destructæ, sacerdotes ejus gementes, virgines ejus squalidæ, et ipsa oppressa amaritudine.

Facti sunt hostes ejus in capite, inimici ejus locupletati sunt: quia dominus locutus est super eam propter multitudinem iniquitatum ejus: parvuli ejus ducti sunt in captivitatem, ante faciem tribulantis.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, convertere ad Dominum Deum tuum.

Et egressus est a filia Sion omnis decor ejus: facti sunt principes ejus velut arietes non invenientes pascua, et abierunt absque fortitudine ante faciem subsequentis.

Recordata est Jerusalem dierum afflictionis suæ, et prevaricationis omnium desiderabilium suorum quæ habuerat a diebus antiquis, cum caderet populus ejus in manu hostili, et non esset auxiliator: viderunt eam hostes, et deriserunt Sabbata ejus.

Peccatum peccavit Jerusalem, propterea instabilis facta est: omnes, qui glorificabant eam, spreverunt illam, quia viderunt ignominiam ejus: ipsa autem gemens conversa est retrorsum.

Sordes ejus in pedibus ejus, nec recordata est finis sui: deposita est vehementer non habens consolatorem: vide Domine afflictionem meam, quoniam erectus est inimicus. Jerusalem, Jerusalem, convertere ad Dominum Deum tuum.

Manum suam misit hostis ad omnia desiderabilia ejus: quia vidit gentes ingressas sanctuarium suum de quibus præceperas, ne intrarent in Ecclesiam Tuam.

Omnis populus ejus gemens, et quærens panem: deriderunt pretiosa quæque pro cibo ad refocillandam animam. Vide Domine, et considera, quoniam facta sum vilis.

O vos omnes, qui transitis per viam, attendite, et videte, si est dolor, sicut dolor meus: quoniam vindemiavit me, ut locutus est Dominus, in die iræ furoris sui.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, convertere ad Dominum Deum tuum.

II.

But sad as is the isolation of England, it is not so sad as the unconcern of her children for her forlorn estate. There is to me something extraordinary and even awful in this carelessness of the heads of the Church of England for the stigmas that lie upon their communion. I pass by the toleration of heresy. I pass by the departures from the rule of antiquity by the page full. I insist upon this one point of isolation. Is not the case a pressing one? It requires no argument: it will not even bear arguing. It stares you in the face: this contradiction in its own terms, this ecclesiastical paradox—a Catholick local Church!

Why should the Church of England be thus condemned to be this several thing in the midst of the world: without a head, without a living voice, without principle of cohesion or common action even within her own pale? Can she contemplate her severance from Christendom and not feel it?

Conceive the magnificent prospects and hopes opened to her view, were the gulf that now sunders her bridged over, or even begun to be closed! Consider her returning power and influence: the isolation gone: the new relations entered into with foreign peoples, not only allied by the articles of a politic peace, but fellow-members in the body of the Lord. Consider the effect of such unity on missionary work abroad! Consider the cessation of hostilities at home! Consider the authority and dignity immediately attaching to her Bishops and priests, to her rites and teaching! Behold, behold how good and joyful a thing it is to dwell together in unity!

12.

Such is the vision of peace that never shall be

seen by these eyes! Once in our history, but never again, was the whole nation restored to unity and the guilt of schism taken off. Now, it must be by other ways. *I will take you one of a city and two of a family and will bring you to Sion, and Ye shall be gathered one by one, O Israel!*

I say to each separated Anglican that the greatest spiritual joy he can experience on earth is waiting for him, if he will only embrace it, the return to unity. It is a practical exemplification of your Reunion Societies, the most practical that you can make. Not like the Marian reconciliation, but a more blessed way; the way of individual submission, the deliberate and formal renunciation of the schism, the voluntary and personal return to the One Body, to the Rock whence we were hewn, to Abraham our father and to Sarah who bare us.

All other hopes of reunion are utterly futile and visionary. From St Peter's See the Britons first, and the English afterwards, received the gospel; and all our weakness and error, all our captivity and dependence may certainly be traced to the evil hour when the bond with our spiritual Mother was broken.

Else, how is it that while the sects are many and divided, the Church has always remained one homogeneous whole? What is the secret principle of this continuous cohesion? Go to the Saints and Fathers and they will tell you. Ask St. Irenæus in the second century, St. Cyprian in the third, St. Jerome in the fourth, St. Augustine in the fifth, the Venerable Bede in the seventh, Alcuin in the ninth, St. Bernard in the twelfth, More and Fisher in the sixteenth!

Let me quote but one of these, St. Cyprian, not only as one of the earliest, but because his words ought to have great weight with English Churchpeople. This great Saint, according to Dr. Pusey, "has been almost

involuntarily chosen as the model," and "honoured as the Apostle" of the Anglican Church. "His writings present the theory of the Episcopate, which bears out our position on one side and the other;" "mitigating its difficulties and justifying our adherence to it."*

Now, on the question of ecclesiastical unity and the key to it, St. Cyprian writes as follows: he speaks of Peter, on whom the Lord built the Church, and from whom He appointed and showed that unity should spring.†. Although He gives to all the Apostles equal power, yet in order to manifest unity, He has by His own authority so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one.‡ There is, he says, One Baptism, One Holy Ghost, and One Church, founded by Christ upon Peter, through an original and principle of unity.§ There is One God, and One Christ, and One Church, and One Chair, founded by the Word of the Lord on the Rock.||

Having thus laid the centre of unity in St. Peter and his Church, St. Cyprian goes on to apply this to the concrete Bishoprick of Rome and the person of the reigning Pontiff. He calls the See of Rome the place of Peter and the rank of the Sacerdotal Chair.** He calls the See of Rome the Chair of Peter and the Principal Church; whence the unity of the Priesthood took its rise and to which faithlessness can have no access.†† He calls the See of Rome the abode of unity and truth.‡‡

* St. Cyp. *Epistles. Library of the Fathers.* Pref. xxi. The curious thing is that in his edition of St. Cyprian, instead of allowing this champion of Anglicanism to speak for himself, Dr. Pusey endeavours by a series of footnotes to invalidate almost every place that tells in favour of the See of Rome. On the other hand, the many and striking passages of the Saint, applicable to and utterly condemnatory of the Anglican position, are passed by unnoticed.

† Cyp. Ep. 73, 7. This and the following passages are all from Dr. Pusey's translation of St. Cyprian.

‡ id de unit. Eccl. 3.

§ Ep. 70, 5.

|| Ep. 43, 4.

** Ep. 55, 6.

†† Ep. 59, 18.

‡‡ Ep. 51.

Its occupant is the Bishop of the most Holy Catholick Church.* To hold communion with the Pope is to hold communion with the Catholick Church.† To be in communion with him is to be in communion as well with the unity as the charity of the Catholick Church.‡ To hold to him is to hold to the root and womb of the Catholick Church.§ And, finally, those who return from schism to the Pope's communion return to their Mother, that is, the Catholick Church.||

The secret, then, of the Church's unity is a secret no longer. The principle which has held all together from the beginning, is the principle of union with the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, and with the chair of the Apostle to whom the promises were made.

The world may look on it as a fortuitous stroke of ecclesiastical policy, which, on account of its tried success, has been continued by successive generations of Popes. But the devout and humble follower of Jesus Christ may be expected at least to take a higher view of the matter. The Saint whom I have quoted regards the point in the light of a heavenly mystery. He calls it the unity of the Gospel Sacrament,** the Sacrament of Unity,†† the Inseparable Sacrament of the Catholick Church.‡‡ The success of which we are witnesses, is the success which unfailingly attends a faithful obedience to the commands of God : in other words, the ordinance has been effectual, simply because the ordinance is Divine.

* Ep. 49, 2 † Ep. 55, 1. ‡ Ep. 48, 2. § Ep. 48, 2.

|| *i.e.* from the Novatian schism at Rome. Ep. 47.

** Cyp. Ep. 54, 1. †† Cyp. Ep. 73, 9. ‡‡ Cyp. Ep. 55, 17.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONCLUSION.

Domine Deus, pacem da nobis, omnia enim præstitisti nobis, pacem quietis, pacem sabbati, sabbati sine vespera. Tu autem bonum nullo indigens bono, semper quietus es, quoniam tua quies tu ipse es. Et hoc intelligere quis hominum dabit homini? quis Angelus Angelo? quis Angelus homini? A te petatur, in te quæretur, ad te pulsetur: sic, sic accipietur, sic invenietur, sic aperietur. Amen.—*St. Aug. Conf. lib. xii. fin.*

YEARS and years ago, I remember that one of my favourite occupations was the indulging in day-dreams of the revival of the English Church. Ritualism was making its appearance; the monastic life was even being attempted by English clergymen: and, as I always held the Reformation in the most unqualified abhorrence, I naturally rejoiced to see these tokens of the mediæval system reappearing in our midst.

I.

Visions came to me of the old churches restored to Catholick usages; old conventual ruins perhaps repaired; the Mass said with Edwardian liturgy and vestments; and the old worship brought back again, *tant bien que mal*, by English clergymen according to strictly English traditions. I had nothing to do with foreign Christians: our own island, with its grand ecclesiastical traditions, its noble mediæval buildings, and its native saints was quite enough for me.

How all this ecclesiastical *volte-face* was to square with the wording of the Articles and Prayerbook, and how

Bishops and patrons of livings and the laity generally, were going to acquiesce in this return to Popery, I did not stop to consider.

These were details which fortunately need never enter into the estimates of such castles in Spain as mine. So I continued to allow myself the pleasure of these innocent visions, to which the actual success of contemporary Ritualism gave a certain stamp of reality.

There were some lines (of Dr. Neale's, I think) predicting the restoration of our Catholick inheritance.

Ye who are fighting the battle for England's church and her glory,

Whenso the battle seems going 'against us remember the legend.

Time there will be, there will be, though we never shall see it in this world,

When by the hands of the men that come after us God shall upraise her ;

She whom we fight for now 'be no more despised or rejected,

But an eternal praise, and a joy of all generations.

There was also an ancient prophecy revived and repeated at the time, to the effect that the Mass which had disappeared under the sixth Edward would reappear under Edward VII.

It was all very exciting and kept us alive. I know that for one, I thought it a paramount duty to wait, and urged others to wait for this blessed consummation ; not giving it a thought that I might die, and, of course, die out of unity before Edward VII. arrived. I had a sort of idea that those who were faithfully working for this prophetic restoration would reap the full benefits of it when it came, and that those who impatiently went over would be shut out from all participation in its joys. I even remember putting this into words in the endeavour to steady one who was strongly moved by the claims of Rome, and my appeal proved successful. Though how

the idea arose, or what even I meant by it, I cannot at this date pretend to explain.

That the prophecy will be fulfilled, that in fact it is being rapidly fulfilled though not in the way I had fondly imagined, I see plainly enough now, but the vision then took a different shape. Dear me ! What a vanity it all was ; and what an agreeable one !

2.

Now, it is evident that, apart from the phenomena of Ritualism, any real or solid foundation for such visionary schemes as mine was to be found in the ancient churches of the country, and in our occupation of them. It was not the mere revival of old forms of worship and ceremonial or their adoption by ritualistic congregations ; but it was the restoring to the ancient buildings the ancient rites for which they were built, that gave such a harmonious reality to the idea.

The association of thought implied in this view of the subject is quite independent of party bias. Few stop to consider the great force which the old mediæval buildings exert in attaching multitudes of our countrymen, of all shades of opinion, to the National Church. Yet I believe it to be strictly true.

Let us consider the point. When an English Churchman thinks of his Church, he thinks of the grand old cathedrals, the antique abbeys and minsters dotted about the country, the old-world parish churches, some of them beautiful and most charming still where the hand of the restorer has yet been stayed.

It is these that make his Church interesting and venerable. These give it its character ; even extending a sort of reflected dignity to the buildings which, from the Restoration downwards, have been erected by Anglicanism itself. If, moreover, to the occupation of these

ancient shrines, be added other relics of the old Catholic heritage, such as "the historic Episcopate" (*i.e.*, the titles of the old sees) to which the Lambeth Fathers wisely appeal, and the portions of the missal and office-books that have been incorporated into the Book of Common Prayer—we have at once an imposing array of evidence testifying to the Church of England's antiquity. They form so many outward and visible signs of an uninterrupted communion with the past, and attach to their present possessors an air of unquestionable Catholicity.

3.

So convinced am I of the weight that English Churchmen tacitly and (for the most part) unconsciously attach to this argument from possession, that I am bound to inquire seriously what it is worth. Yes, seriously: for the question is not the childish one it may appear.

Putting aside for a moment the inference drawn from it, the possession itself is, surely, everything to members of the Church of England; and, if I ask them what would be their case if they were put out of possession, they will admit that the proposition merits consideration.

For the sake of argument, then, let me suppose Anglicanism stripped of everything that is not strictly hers. Let us take from her Prayerbook everything that she has borrowed from the Breviary and the Missal—Tersanctus and Gloria, Versicle and Response, Preface, Canticles, Collects, Epistles, Gospels, Creeds, and Psalms—and let us leave nothing in the book but what she has inscribed there truly of her own.

Let us further suppose its Bishops obliged to divest themselves of the titles of the ancient Sees, its clergy and people dispossessed of every building that the National Church did not erect, and the whole community sent out

into the world, *inops et peregrina*, with nothing but their faith and their prayers to recommend them.

In short, let us suppose the Anglican body placed in exactly the same position as the Catholick Church in this country, and let us imagine how much of its influence and its prestige would survive the change.

It would then be seen, if never before, how much of its imposing character is due to sources not of its own creating. Whatsoever charm, or venerableness, or interestingness Anglicanism possesses, is not its own but another's. Even the very semblance of a Church which it wears before the world comes from the spoils of Rome which the conqueror has thrown over the creature of his hand.

4.

As to the inference drawn from possession—for the argument, though unexpressed, is still implied—I think considerable light would be thrown upon the whole question if we looked for a moment at the state of things outside of England.

We go, for example, to Notre Dame de Paris, or to Cologne Cathedral, or to Seville, or to some most antique Ravenna basilica; and we have no sort of doubt that the services which are being said there and the priests which are saying them, are neither novel or intruded, but the legitimate and orderly successors of the ritual and the priesthood for which those buildings were designed.

At Lausanne we find the once-Catholick Cathedral in the hands of the Calvinists; at Utrecht, in the possession of the Reformed Dutch Church. And, again, we have no kind of doubt as to the real character of the present occupants, nor do we think of them, for an instant, in the light of Catholics.

Nearer home, we enter Glasgow Cathedral and find the Established Church of Scotland installed there, and the same sect in possession of the old cathedral of Edinburgh. Again, the fact of these buildings being of Catholick origin does not blind us to the real nature of the religion which is taught there. An English Churchman would be the first to admit that it was simple heresy.

Where, then, is the line to be drawn between the history of these old Scottish or Dutch or Swiss cathedrals with their present occupants, and the occupation of similar mediæval buildings throughout the length and breadth of England?

Where, to touch more fundamental ground, is the origin itself of the Church of England to be derived in a different way to that from which sprang the rest of the Reformed Communions in Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Scotland, and Scandinavia?

I will take one of these, the last. In 1527, the Roman Catholick Church of Sweden was abolished, and Lutheranism put in its place. The religious Orders were dissolved and their lands confiscated. The Bishops fled, or were deprived. A great part of the inferior clergy conformed to the heresy; marriage was permitted, the office said in the vulgar tongue, and the pure Word of God preached. The old Catholick cathedrals and churches were handed over to the new order of ministers. Twelve "Bishops" (with an "Archbishop," of Upsala at their head) were installed in the seats of the evicted Roman prelates, and the whole organization placed beneath the iron heel of the Sovereign.

This instance, I may remark in passing, should be a warning to those who attach any weight to prescriptive tenure by itself, least of all in matters ecclesiastical. The Swedish State Church exists and flourishes at the present

hour. It is almost venerable with age, being older than the English by thirty odd years. Yet no well-informed Anglican accepts the Scandinavian body for a moment, or regards it as anything else than a mere creation of the State, such is the clearness with which we can pronounce upon an abstract question.

5.

But, to resume the subject, is there any essential difference between the history of Gustavus's establishment of Lutheranism in Sweden, and Elizabeth's establishment in England of the doctrines of Augsburg and Geneva which are known under the name of the Prayer Book and Thirty-nine Articles?

Is there any difference in kind between the two: in the faith and teachers displaced, in the faith and teachers intruded; in the kinds of supremacy, whether abolished or substituted; in the policy which dictated the change; in the power which effected it; and, lastly, in the great religious movement of the age which was at the bottom of it all? The parallel is a close one. May it not be said, on the point of historical origin, to be absolutely identical?

"Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning," says Bishop Pearson on the Article of the Creed, "pretendeth to a new Churchdom, and whatsoever is new, is none." Of the large and bold pretensions of Anglicanism to an old beginning and a primitive foundation, I am well aware; and those who wish for arguments in support of the hypothesis can find them in abundance without my help.

What I am concerned with is, not what may be pretended, but what is really believed. Do Englishmen, do English Churchmen even, really believe that the Church of England has any other origin than that which it has

in common with the other Reformed Communion of the sixteenth century? Is it sincerely believed that the religion of Elizabeth is one and the same with that which endured from Augustine to the days of Wolsey?

If this be maintained, it must be maintained in the face of history, in the face of facts, of the commonsense view of the thing, and of an irremovable impression the other way. But if it cannot be maintained, why not confess the truth? Why should Anglicanism be ashamed of its origin and its history?

Surely, it is a very respectable record: a foundation of two of our mightiest and most famous princes; a calendar of hundreds of devout and exemplary lives; a roll of names illustrious all over the world; a splendid and classic literature; a highly privileged position; a following of nearly all that is great and noble and mighty in the land; an inferior clergy of an education and social rank second to no other in Christendom; a hierarchy of spiritual peers and great ecclesiastical dignitaries; and, to crown all, a Royal supremacy and the recognition of the State, as the most favoured community in the Realm! I cannot for the life of me see what there is to be ashamed of in this. Is it not enough?

6.

Ah, no! It is not enough. The Established Church aspires to be Catholick. Seated in the old Roman inheritance, it puts forth its hand to arrogate those spiritual insignia, those supernatural functions, those tokens not of earth or of this world that belong to one alone. In order to arrive at this, a continuity with the ancient religion is boldly asserted; a virtual identity of faith and order and fellowship with the Mediæval Church is freely alleged: and a theory, capable of sustaining the whole of the spiritual claims of Anglicanism, is propounded;

which, on examination, is found to turn upon a single point, a single event, a single individual—the craziest link in a crazy chain—the consecration of William Barlow !

Such is the latest pretence by which the Church of England seeks to justify its occupation of the Roman reversion, sooner than admit that it owes possession to King, Lords and Commons. But how long is this farce to continue? How long will Anglican apologists and Anglican writers of history continue to come before the public with this version of the case as though there were no other, and not hear the voice of conscience saying, Is there not a lie in my right hand?

The traces of Catholicism still surviving in the Established Church, which many regard as its choicest treasure, I, on the contrary, cannot help considering to have been its greatest misfortune. They were a snare, and a dangerous one. They offered the temptation of playing with ecclesiastical *insignia* which rightly belonged to one Body alone. Still, this would not so much have mattered if they had been left with the other relics of mediævalism in the lumber-room to which the Reformers had consigned them. But it was not to be. The Tractarians arrived upon the scene, and then all the fat was in the fire ! They dragged out such tokens of the old religion as survived, repaired and refurbished them, and clapped them bodily upon the Church and Stateism of Protestant England. The consequences may be imagined. Ever since that fatal hour the National Church has been endeavouring to act a part for which its founders never designed it, and the attempt to play the Anglo-Catholick *rôle*, between ecclesiastical antiquity on the one side and the events of the Reformation on the other, has only resulted in more effectually

exposing the inconsistencies and absurdities of the position.

7.

In the meantime, phenomena such as Lambeth synods, and correspondence with Orthodox metropolitans and Oriental patriarchs, and Church extension, and new bishoprics, and Ritualism, and ecclesiastical trials serve to occupy and divert the mind. They fill up the time and prevent facts being fairly faced. They hinder thought, and thought is fatal to Anglicanism. There are thoughts suggested by a single verse, or even by a few words of Holy Scripture, sufficient to shake the Anglican position to its foundations, in the mind of anyone who seriously reflects upon their meaning.

When Our Lord, for instance, promises that His Church should be One Flock, what does He mean?

Now, do pause a moment to think of this. Nothing that you have to do to-day, nothing that you have to do to-morrow, nothing that you have to do the days that follow or the weeks that follow, is one-half so worthy of your attention as these two little monosyllables, One Flock, or (if you will) One Fold. The only italics I will indulge in throughout the whole course of these pages shall be employed to make it clearer to you; and your soul is worth far more than this. Here, then, is the question once more.

Question.—When Our Lord promises that His Church should be *One Fold*, what does He *mean*? Does He intend *any* importance to be attached to the word “One”?

Answer.—The Anglican interpretation is this. It finds a fulfilment of the Divine promise in a series of rival and hostile encampments, not even possessing the modicum of mutual relations obtaining between two countries in time of war.

Question.—Once more. When Our Lord speaks of building His Church upon Peter or (if you prefer it) upon Peter's faith, with the guarantee that neither the Church of Peter nor the faith of Peter should fail—what does He mean?

Answer.—The Church of England thinks that it means this : a Church which has so wholly failed in the matter of faith, that it teaches contradictory doctrines, and tolerates mutually destructive views upon one and the same point of revealed truth.

And see the blasphemy that this amounts to ! It is to say that the Church of Jesus Christ, the Bride of the Lamb, the new Eve taken from His sacred side upon the tree, the work which He came from Heaven to do, the crown of His labours and the travail of His soul—has failed ! Failed, in spite of His passion ! Failed, in spite of His prayers ! Failed, in spite of His promises ! Failed utterly, hopelessly, irremediably, and the gates of Hell triumphed—and why ? Why ? For the best of all possible reasons : because, without this assumption of failure, Anglicans cannot consistently interpret the words of the Evangelists.

But they have been written about before : **“The spiritual disciple (says St. Irenæus) will judge also those that work schisms ; who are devoid of the love of God, considering their own advantage rather than the unity of the Church ; and who for slight and trivial causes rend and divide the great and glorious Body of Christ, and as far as in them lies, bring it to nothing. They speak peace, but they work war : straining indeed at a gnat, and swallowing a camel. Since no correction that they can effect, will compensate for the injury which arises from schism.”*

* *Adv Hær.* 4, 33, 7.

8.

Ah yes ! From schism to unity, from resistance to submission, from rebellion to obedience, from disquiet to peace, from fears to hope, from uncertainty to knowledge, from opinion to faith——what a step it is, what a step it is !*

I think also of other immediate gains accompanying the step. There is the signal and complete disavowal of the sin of the Lutheran revolt against the Church. There is the entire removal of all complicity with the awful apostasy of the founders of the Church of England. There is the entire deliverance from the hideous and unnatural incubus of Erastianism, and an entrance beneath the purely spiritual rule of the successor of Prophet and of Apostle.

These are more or less negative gains : let me speak of some more positive. If I mention only one of these—

* Here is an instance of what I mean. Since becoming a Catholic I notice a complete cease from all discussing of evidences. I am not, of course, referring to those outside ; but where Catholics are speaking to Catholics, in the pulpit, the papers, books, conversation, and the like—they are no longer nervously assuring and reassuring themselves that their religion is the most Scriptural, or the most primitive, or the purest, or the most rational, or the most Catholic, or the most historical in the world. Such questionings never occur to the mind. Nor, again, is the Catholic preacher continually establishing his point, and showing the antiquity or the congruity or the Scripture for this or that dogma, precept or practice. The Anglican was always engaged in this weary work, and I know how unsatisfactory it was. Besides being in itself unsettling, the argument however well-reasoned, never seemed to the hearer to rise beyond the level of private and personal opinion. Now, the Catholic pastor rarely does this. In his sermon or catechising he lays down the teaching intelligibly and with precision, but he does not produce his authority. But, should he have to substantiate the doctrine—then I see at once that he does not stand alone. I see that he has at his back not only the witness of all Scripture and all antiquity, but the living voice of the living Church all over the world echoing in identical tones every word he utters ; and if this be not authority in religious matters, there is no such thing on the earth.

the gift of Catholick Communion—I name one that should alone quicken the pulses of those that have yearned for some realization of the promises and prophecies of Scripture.

You, who do me the honour to read these pages, were you to submit to Holy Church to-day, to-day should you enter into full enjoyment of this heart-moving and transcendent privilege. A privilege so fresh and so exhilarating in its experience, coming to one suddenly amid a dreary waste of disappointed hopes, that it would seem almost better (if I may say so) to have been converted to the faith rather than to have been born in it, so great is the joy of those who enter in at last into the long deferred possession.

Thus would you be able to say and to feel:—"I am in communion with all places and with all time; with nations and tongues and peoples and languages. The Catholics of India, of Russia, of Corea, of China, of Scotland, of Australia, of both Americas, of Molokai, and of England are mine. Every martyr that went joyfully to his reward in the awful prolonged persecution of Diocletian is mine. Every faithful religious, or priest, or layman swallowed up in the river of blood of the French Revolution is mine. Every man, woman, or child that for the Faith went to the fire, or the axe, or the hangman's knife, or the press, or the torture under Henry and Edward, and Elizabeth and James is mine, absolutely mine. And others were racked, not accepting deliverance, that they might find a better resurrection. And others had trial of mockeries and stripes, moreover also of bonds and prisons. They were stoned, they were cut asunder, they were tempted, they were put to death with the sword."

All this should you say with perfect propriety and

with unquestioned right of possession. Although you might not realise it all at once, yet you would do so by degrees with wondering and ever-increasing delight. "Then shalt thou see, and abound, and thy heart shall wonder and be enlarged," as the ripple of pious thought flows from country to country, and people to people, and continent to continent, covering all in its charitable embrace ; and going backwards and forwards ; and descending from the present into all the remote recesses of the past, to look at all the treasures you have gained, all these children that God has given you in reward for your obedience. The line of illustrious Pontiffs that have adorned St. Peter's throne ; the array of sainted Confessors and Doctors ; the great religious Orders of the Church that have helped to consolidate its fabric and preserve its learning and convert the heathen and reclaim the heretic ; and all the lives and deaths of holy men and women who have glorified God in all nations, and especially in this dear land of ours. The pages of Ecclesiastical history, that you will now read as the annals of your own and not another faith ; the art which the Church has inspired, the architecture which she has called into her service, the literature she has created, the intellects and gifts of all kinds that she has been able to command—all these, *Carissime*, are yours, and none shall take them from you.

9.

There is one more blessing which the convert receives on coming to the Church, and which I will touch upon briefly and so conclude—I mean the blessing of authority.

This is an advantage which one must long have been deprived of to appreciate it in all its fulness : the unutterable comfort that it is to find, at last, a voice which speaks with firm and unfaltering tones upon all those points

which it concerns a Christian to know. Authority in matters of faith : doctrines prescribed, not for the disciple to debate, criticise, and choose from, but for him to accept in their entirety as the teaching of a Church that cannot err.

Authority in morals : the privilege of having the life brought once more under rule ; the blessing of guidance in things lawful and things forbidden ; duties enjoined, obligations imposed, commands to be obeyed—all arising out of the new relations contracted, and all complied with as the act of legitimate spiritual jurisdiction. The yoke may be easy and the burden light, still it is a yoke and a discipline, which comes most sweetly and gratefully to those who have known no rule but their own self-pleasing.

10.

There are some famous lines that every lover of Wordsworth reveres and cherishes ; and beautiful as they are in themselves, I have often thought that they would lose little of their force were we to apply them to the Catholick Church, and to that concrete expression of Duty, or rather of its counterpart, Obedience, which is of the very essence of the mystical Body of Christ.

How much of the Ode holds good if viewed in this light ! As the conscience of humanity and the divinely appointed ruler of the children of men, we may address the Church as “a light to guide, a rod to check the erring and reprove,” and say :

Thou who art victory and law
When empty terrors overawe ;
From vain temptations dost set free,
And calm'st the weary strife of frail humanity !

It is not every one perhaps that can lay claim to the inflexible principles of the poet himself ; but with that exception the convert may truly say :

I, loving freedom, and untried ;
 No sport of every random gust,
 Yet being to myself a guide,
 Too blindly have reposed my trust.

Then there is the call, so long echoed by the inner voice,
 and so long delayed :

Full oft, when in my heart was heard
 Thy timely mandate, I deferred
 The task imposed, from day to day :
 But thee I now would serve more strictly, if I may.

* * * *

Me this unchartered freedom tires ;
 I feel the weight of chance desires :
 My hopes no more must change their name,
 I long for a repose which ever is the same.

Shall we go on, also, to find the same parallelism of
 thought in the lines immediately succeeding ?

Stern lawgiver ! Yet thou dost wear
 The Godhead's most benignant grace ;
 Nor know we anything so fair
 As is the smile upon thy face !

At least, the concluding stanza is full of meaning and
 application in this connection ; and the child of the
 Church may most fitly invoke his newly-found spiritual
 mother in the words that follow :

To humbler functions, Awful Power,
 I call thee : I myself commend
 Unto thy guidance from this hour ;
 Oh, let my weakness have an end !
 Give unto me, made lowly wise,
 The spirit of self-sacrifice ;
 The confidence of reason give
 And, in the light of truth, thy bondman let me live.

END.

SELECTION
FROM
BURNS & OATES'
Catalogue
OF
PUBLICATIONS.



LONDON: BURNS AND OATES, LD.

ORCHARD ST., W., & 63 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

NEW YORK: 9 BARCLAY STREET.

1890.

NEW BOOKS.

Ritus Servandus in Expositione et Benedictione Sanctissimi Sacramenti ex Decreto XXIII. N^o Concilii Provincialis Westmonasteriensis I. ubique in Anglia adhibendus. New and enlarged Edition (1889), recently approved by the Bishops of England. 4to. Cloth, 5s. net; and in other bindings.

The Perfection of Man by Charity; A Spiritual Treatise. By the Rev. FATHER REGINALD BUCKLER, O.P. Cloth, 5s.

History of the Seven Holy Founders of the Order of the Servants of Mary. By the Rev. S. M. LEDOUX, of the same Order. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations. By THOMAS W. ALLIES, K.C.S.G. Demy 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

"We give it as our deliberate and carefully formed judgment that Mr. Allies' great work on the 'Formation of Christendom' stands simply unrivalled and alone in its own department of English literature."—*Tablet*.

Old English Catholic Missions. By JOHN ORLEBAR PAYNE, M.A., Editor of "The English Catholic Non-Jurors of 1715," &c. In one volume, demy 8vo, half-bound, price 7s. 6d.

Characteristics from the Writings of Archbishop Ullathorne, together with a Bibliographical Account of the Archbishop's Works. By the Rev. M. F. GLANCEY. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

Chapters on the Parables of our Lord. By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. Quarterly Series. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

The Life of Dom Bosco, Founder of the Salesian Society. Translated from the French of J. M. Villefranche, by LADY MARTIN. With a Portrait of Dom Bosco. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Salvage from the Wreck. A few Memories of the Dead preserved in Funeral Discourses. By the Rev. FATHER GALLWEY, S.J. With Portraits. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

Life of Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque of the Sacred Heart. By the Rev. ALBERT BARRY, C.S.S.R. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Convent Life: or, The Duties of Sisters dedicated in Religion to the Service of God. By the Rev. ARTHUR DEVINE, Passionist. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 5s. net.

Growth in the Knowledge of our Lord. Meditations for every Day of the Year, exclusive of those for Festivals, Days of Retreat, &c. Adapted from the Original of Abbé de Brandt, by SISTER MARY FIDELIS. A New and Improved Edition, in 3 Volumes. Price 22s. 6d. the set. Sold only in sets.

Dr. Hettinger's Evidences of Christianity. Edited by the Rev. H. S. BOWDEN, of the Oratory, with the Author's approval. The first volume of Dr. Hettinger's great work, "Apologie des Christenthums," entitled, "NATURAL RELIGION," will be ready early in the year.

SELECTION

FROM

BURNS AND OATES' CATALOGUE OF PUBLICATIONS.



ALLIES, T. W. (K.C.S.G.)

Formation of Christendom. Vols. I., II., III. . each	£0 12 0
Church and State as seen in the Formation of Christen- dom, 8vo, pp. 472, cloth	0 14 0
The Throne of the Fisherman, built by the Carpenter's Son, the Root, the Bond, and the Crown of Christen- dom. Demy 8vo	0 10 0

"It would be quite superfluous at this hour of the day to recommend Mr. Allies' writings to English Catholics. Those of our readers who remember the article on his writings in the *Katholik*, know that he is esteemed in Germany as one of our foremost writers."—*Dublin Review*.

ALLIES, MARY.

Leaves from St. John Chrysostom, With introduction by T. W. Allies, K.C.S.G. Crown 8vo, cloth	0 6 0
--	-------

"Miss Allies 'Leaves' are delightful reading; the English is remarkably pure and graceful; page after page reads as if it were original. No commentator, Catholic or Protestant, has ever surpassed St. John Chrysostom in the knowledge of Holy Scripture, and his learning was of a kind which is of service now as it was at the time when the inhabitants of a great city hung on his words."—*Tablet*.

ALLNATT, C. F. B.

Cathedra Petri. Third and Enlarged Edition. Paper.	0 5 0
--	-------

"Invaluable to the controversialist and the theologian, and most useful for educated men inquiring after truth or anxious to know the positive testimony of Christian antiquity in favour of Papal claims."—*Month*.

Which is the True Church?. New Edition	0 1 4
The Church and the Sects.	0 1 0

ANNUS SANCTUS:

Hymns of the Church for the Ecclesiastical Year.

Translated from the Sacred Offices by various
Authors, with Modern, Original, and other Hymns,
and an Appendix of Earlier Versions. Selected and
Arranged by ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

Popular edition, in two parts each	0 1 0
In stiff boards	0 3 6
Plain Cloth, lettered	0 5 0
Edition de luxe	0 10 6

ANSWERS TO ATHEISTS: OR NOTES ON

Ingersoll. By the Rev. A. Lambert, (over 100,000 copies

sold in America). Ninth edition. Paper. £0 0 6

Cloth 0 1 0

B. N.

The Jesuits: their Foundation and History. 2 vols.

crown 8vo, cloth, red edges 0 15 0

"The book is just what it professes to be—a popular history, drawn from well-known sources," &c.—*Month*.

BACQUEZ, L'ABBE.

The "Divine Office": From the French of l'Abbé

Bacquez, of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. Edited

by the Rev. Father Taunton, of the Congregation

of the Oblates of St. Charles. Cloth 0 6 0

"The translation of this most edifying work from the walls of St. Sulpice, the source of so much sacerdotal perfection, comes to us most opportunely, and we heartily commend it to the use of the clergy and of the faithful." THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

"A very complete manual, learned, wholesome, and devout."—*Saturday Review*.

BORROMEO, LIFE OF ST. CHARLES.

From the Italian of Peter Guissano. 2 vols. 0 15 0

"A standard work, which has stood the test of succeeding ages; it is certainly the finest work on St. Charles in an English dress."—*Tablet*.

BOWDEN, REV. H. S. (of the Oratory) Edited by.

Dante's Divina Commedia: Its scope and value.

From the German of FRANCIS HETTINGER, D.D.

With an engraving of Dante. Crown 8vo 0 10 6

"All that Venturi attempted to do has been now approached with far greater power and learning by Dr. Hettinger, who, as the author of the 'Apologie des Christenthums,' and as a great Catholic theologian, is eminently well qualified for the task he has undertaken."—*The Saturday Review*.

BRIDGETT, REV. T. E. (C.S.S.R.).

Discipline of Drink 0 3 6

"The historical information with which the book abounds gives evidence of deep research and patient study, and imparts a permanent interest to the volume, which will elevate it to a position of authority and importance enjoyed by few of its compeers."—*The Arrow*.

Our Lady's Dowry; how England Won and Lost that

Title. Popular Edition [Shortly 0 5 0

"This book is the ablest vindication of Catholic devotion to Our Lady, drawn from tradition, that we know of in the English language."—*Tablet*.

Ritual of the New Testament. An essay on the prin-

ciples and origin of Catholic Ritual in reference to
the New Testament. Third edition 0 5 0

BRIDGETT, REV. T. E. (C.S.S.R.)—continued.

The Life of the Blessed John Fisher. With a reproduction of the famous portrait of Blessed JOHN FISHER by HOLBEIN, and other Illustrations. Cloth £0 7 6

"The Life of Blessed John Fisher could hardly fail to be interesting and instructive. Sketched by Father Bridgett's practised pen, the portrait of this holy martyr is no less vividly displayed in the printed pages of the book than in the wonderful picture of Holbein, which forms the frontispiece."—*Tablet*.

The True Story of the Catholic Hierarchy deposed by Queen Elizabeth, with fuller Memoirs of its Last Two Survivors. By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R., and the late Rev. T. F. KNOX, D.D., of the London Oratory. Crown 8vo, cloth, 0 7 6

"We have to express our obligation to Father Bridgett for the volume he has given us. It is full of instruction and interest, will correct many popular impressions, and manifests on every page an industry and exactness which in these days is rare."—*Dublin Review*.

"We gladly acknowledge the value of this work on a subject which has been obscured by prejudice and carelessness."—*Saturday Review*.

BRIDGETT, REV. T. E. (C.S.S.R.), Edited by.

Souls Departed. By CARDINAL ALLEN. First published in 1565, now edited in modern spelling by the Rev. T. E. Bridgett 0 6 0

CASWALL, FATHER.

Catholic Latin Instructor in the Principal Church Offices and Devotions, for the Use of Choirs, Convents, and Mission Schools, and for Self-Teaching. 1 vol., complete 0 3 6

Or Part I., containing Benediction, Mass, Serving at Mass, and various Latin Prayers in ordinary use 0 1 6

May Pageant : A Tale of Tintern. (A Poem) Second edition 0 2 0

Poems 0 5 0

Lyra Catholica, containing all the Breviary and Missal Hymns, with others from various sources. 32mo, cloth, red edges 0 2 6

CATHOLIC BELIEF: OR, A SHORT AND

Simple Exposition of Catholic Doctrine. By the Very Rev. Joseph Faà di Bruno, D.D. Eighth edition Price 6d.; post free, 0 0 8½

Cloth, lettered, 0 0 10

Also an edition on better paper and bound in cloth, with gilt lettering and steel frontispiece 0 2 0

CHALLONER, BISHOP.

Meditations for every day in the year. New edition. Revised and edited by the Right Rev. John Virtue, D.D., Bishop of Portsmouth. 8vo. 5th edition 0 3 0

And in other bindings.

COLERIDGE, REV. H. J. (S.J.)*(See Quarterly Series.)***DEHARBE, FATHER JOSEPH, (S.J.)**

A History of Religion, or the Evidences of the Divinity of the Christian Religion, as furnished by its History from the Creation of the World to our own Times. Designed as a Help to Catechetical Instruction in Schools and Churches. Pp. 628. net £0 8 6

DEVAS, C. S.

Studies of Family Life: a contribution to Social Science. Crown 8vo 0 5 0

"We recommend these pages and the remarkable evidence brought together in them to the careful attention of all who are interested in the well-being of our common humanity."—*Guardian*.

"Both thoughtful and stimulating."—*Saturday Review*.

DRANE, AUGUSTA THEODOSIA.

History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions.

A new edition in two vols. 0 12 6

"It has been reserved for the author of the present work to give us a complete biography of St. Catherine. . . . Perhaps the greatest success of the writer is the way in which she has contrived to make the Saint herself live in the pages of the book."—*Tablet*.

EYRE, MOST REV. CHARLES, (Abp. of Glasgow).

The History of St. Cuthbert: or, An Account of his Life, Decease, and Miracles. Third edition. Illustrated with maps, charts, &c., and handsomely bound in cloth. Royal 8vo 0 14 0

"A handsome, well appointed volume, in every way worthy of its illustrious subject. . . . The chief impression of the whole is the picture of a great and good man drawn by a sympathetic hand."—*Spectator*.

FABER, REV. FREDERICK WILLIAM, (D.D.)

All for Jesus	0 5 0
Bethlehem	0 7 0
Blessed Sacrament	0 7 6
Creator and Creature	0 6 0
Ethel's Book of the Angels.	0 5 0
Foot of the Cross	0 6 0
Growth in Holiness	0 6 0
Hymns	0 6 0
Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects, 2 vols. each	0 5 0
Poems	0 5 0
Precious Blood	0 5 0
Sir Lancelot	0 5 0
Spiritual Conferences	0 6 0
Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. By John Edward Bowden of the same Congregation	0 6 0

FOLEY, REV. HENRY, (S.J.)

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Vol. I., Series I.	net	£1 6 0
Vol. II., Series II., III., IV.	net	1 6 0
Vol. III., Series V., VI., VII., VIII.	net	1 10 0
Vol. IV. Series IX., X., XI.	net	1 6 0
Vol. V., Series XII. with nine Photographs of Martyrs	net	1 10 0
Vol. VI., Diary and Pilgrim-Book of the English College, Rome. The Diary from 1579 to 1773, with Biographical and Historical Notes. The Pilgrim-Book of the Ancient English Hospice attached to the College from 1580 to 1656, with Historical Notes	net	1 6 0
Vol. VII. Part the First: General Statistics of the Province; and Collectanea, giving Biographical Notices of its Members and of many Irish and Scotch Jesuits. With 20 Photographs	net	1 6 0
Vol. VII. Part the Second: Collectanea, Completed; With Appendices. Catalogues of Assumed and Real Names: Annual Letters; Biographies and Miscellanea.	net	1 6 0

"As a biographical dictionary of English Jesuits, it deserves a place in every well-selected library, and, as a collection of marvellous occurrences, persecutions, martyrdoms, and evidences of the results of faith, amongst the books of all who belong to the Catholic Church."—*Genealogist*.

FORMBY, REV. HENRY.

Monotheism: in the main derived from the Hebrew nation and the Law of Moses. The Primitive Religion of the City of Rome. An historical Investigation. Demy 8vo.

0 5 0

FRANCIS DE SALES, ST.: THE WORKS OF.

Translated into the English Language by the Rev. H. B. Mackey, O.S.B., under the direction of the Right Rev. Bishop Hedley, O.S.B.

Vol. I. Letters to Persons in the World. Cloth

0 6 0

"The letters must be read in order to comprehend the charm and sweetness of their style."—*Tablet*.

Vol. II.—The Treatise on the Love of God. Father Carr's translation of 1630 has been taken as a basis, but it has been modernized and thoroughly revised and corrected.

0 9 0

"To those who are seeking perfection by the path of contemplation this volume will be an armoury of help."—*Saturday Review*.

Vol. III. The Catholic Controversy.

0 6 0

"No one who has not read it can conceive how clear, how convincing, and how well adapted to our present needs are these controversial 'leaves.'"—*Tablet*.

FRANCIS DE SALES, ST.: WORKS OF.—*continued.*

Vol. IV. Letters to Persons in Religion, with introduction by Bishop Hedley on "St. Francis de Sales and the Religious State." £0 6 0

"The sincere piety and goodness, the grave wisdom, the knowledge of human nature, the tenderness for its weakness, and the desire for its perfection that pervade the letters, make them pregnant of instruction for all serious persons. The translation and editing have been admirably done."—*Scotsman*.

* * Other vols. in preparation.

GALLWEY, REV. PETER, (S.J.)

Precious Pearl of Hope in the Mercy of God, The. Translated from the Italian. With Preface by the Rev. Father Gallwey. Cloth. 0 4 6

Lectures on Ritualism and on the Anglican Orders. 0 8 0

2 vols.

Or may be had separately.

GIBSON, REV. H.

Catechism Made Easy. Being an Explanation of the Christian Doctrine. Fourth edition. 2 vols., cloth 0 7 6

"This work must be of priceless worth to any who are engaged in any form of catechetical instruction. It is the best book of the kind that we have seen in English."—*Irish Monthly*.

GILLOW, JOSEPH.

Literary and Biographical History, or, Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics. From the Breach with Rome, in 1534, to the Present Time. Vols. I., II. and III. cloth, demy 8vo. . . each. 0 15 0

* * Other vols. in preparation.

"The patient research of Mr. Gillow, his conscientious record of minute particulars, and especially his exhaustive bibliographical information in connection with each name, are beyond praise."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"No such important or novel contribution has been made to English bibliography for a long time."—*Scotsman*.

The Haydock Papers. Illustrated. Demy 8vo. . . 0 7 6

"The *Haydock Papers* which have been read with much interest by Catholics all over England at the time they were first made public in the pages of *Merry England*, are now given to us in collected form in one volume. We commend this collection to the attention of every one that is interested in the records of the sufferings and struggles of our ancestors to hand down the faith to their children. It is in the perusal of such details that we bring home to ourselves the truly heroic sacrifices that our forefathers endured in those dark and dismal times. The book deserves a niche in every Catholic house."—*Tablet*.

HEDLEY, BISHOP.

Our Divine Saviour, and other Discourses. Crown 8vo. 0 6 0

"A distinct and noteworthy feature of these sermons is, we certainly think, their freshness—freshness of thought, treatment, and style; nowhere do we meet pulpit commonplace or hackneyed phrase—everywhere, on the contrary, it is the heart of the preacher pouring out to his flock his own deep convictions, enforcing them from the 'Treasures, old and new,' of a cultivated mind."—*Dublin Review*.

HUMPHREY, REV. W. (S.J.)

Suarez on the Religious State : A Digest of the Doctrine contained in his Treatise, "De Statû Religionis."

3 vols., pp. 1200. Cloth, roy. 8vo. £1 10 0

"This laborious and skilfully executed work is a distinct addition to English theological literature. Father Humphrey's style is quiet, methodical, precise, and as clear as the subject admits. Every one will be struck with the air of legal exposition which pervades the book. He takes a grip of his author, under which the text yields up every atom of its meaning and force."—*Dublin Review*.

LEDoux, REV. S. M.

History of the Seven Holy Founders of the Order of the Servants of Mary. Crown 8vo, cloth 0 4 6

"Throws a full light upon the Seven Saints recently canonized, whom we see as they really were. All that was marvellous in their call, their works, and their death is given with the charm of a picturesque and speaking style. Instead of writing seven separate biographies, as another author less happily inspired has recently done, Father Ledoux tells at once the story of these seven lives, more linked together than the five fingers of a hand; whilst he clearly brings out that which was characteristic of each."—*Messenger of the Sacred Heart*.

LEE, REV. F. G., D.D. (of All Saints, Lambeth.)

Edward the Sixth : Supreme Head. Second edition.

Crown 8vo 0 6 0

"In vivid interest and in literary power, no less than in solid historical value, Dr. Lee's present work comes fully up to the standard of its predecessors; and to say that is to bestow high praise. The book evinces Dr. Lee's customary diligence of research in amassing facts, and his rare artistic power in welding them into a harmonious and effective whole."—*John Bull*.

LIFE OF FATHER CHAMPAGNAT

Founder of the Society of the Little Brothers of Mary.

Containing a portrait of Fr. CHAMPAGNAT, and four full page illustrations. Demy 8vo 0 8 0

"A work of great practical utility, and one eminently suited to these times."—*Tablet*.

"A serious and able essay on the science and art of the Christian education of children, exemplified in the career of one who gave his life to it."—*Dublin Review*.

LIGUORI, ST. ALPHONSUS.

New and Improved Translation of the Complete Works of St. Alphonsus, edited by the late Bishop Coffin :—

Vol. 1. The Christian Virtues, and the Means for Obtaining them. Cloth elegant 0 4 0

Or separately :—

1. The Love of our Lord Jesus Christ 0 1 4

2. Treatise on Prayer. (*In the ordinary editions a great part of this work is omitted*) 0 1 4

3. A Christian's rule of Life 0 1 0

LIGUORI, ST. ALPHONSUS.—*continued.*

Vol. II. The Mysteries of the Faith—The Incarnation ; containing Meditations and Devotions on the Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, &c., suited for Advent and Christmas.	£o	3	6
Cheap edition	o	2	0
Vol. III. The Mysteries of the Faith—The Blessed Sacrament	o	3	6
Cheap edition	o	2	0
Vol. IV. Eternal Truths—Preparation for Death	o	3	6
Cheap edition	o	2	0
Vol. V. Treatises on the Passion, containing "Jesus hath loved us," &c.	o	3	0
Cheap edition	o	2	0
Vol. VI. Glories of Mary. New edition	o	3	6
With Frontispiece, cloth	o	4	6
Also in better bindings.			

LIVIUS, REV. T. (M.A., C.S.S.R.)

St. Peter, Bishop of Rome ; or, the Roman Episcopate of the Prince of the Apostles, proved from the Fathers, History and Chronology, and illustrated by arguments from other sources. Dedicated to his Eminence Cardinal Newman. Demy 8vo, cloth	o	12	0
Explanation of the Psalms and Canticles in the Divine Office. By ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Translated from the Italian by THOMAS LIVIUS, C.S.S.R. With a Preface by his Eminence Cardinal MANNING. Crown 8vo, cloth	o	7	6

MANNING, CARDINAL.

Blessed Sacrament the Centre of Immutable Truth. Second edition	o	1	0
Confidence in God. Fourth edition	o	1	0
England and Christendom	o	10	6
Eternal Priesthood. Eighth Edition	o	2	6
Four Great Evils of the Day. Fifth Edition. Paper Cloth	o	2	6
Fourfold Sovereignty of God. Third edition. Paper Cloth	o	3	6
Glories of the Sacred Heart. Fifth edition.	o	6	0
Grounds of Faith. Eighth edition.	o	1	6
Holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ according to St. John. With a Preface by His Eminence.	o	1	0
Religio Viatoris. Third Edition. Wrapper.	o	1	0
Cloth.	o	2	0
Independence of the Holy See. Second Edition.	o	5	0
Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost. Fourth edition	o	8	6
Love of Jesus to Penitents. Eighth edition	o	1	6
Miscellanies. 3 vols. each	o	6	0

MANNING, CARDINAL—*continued.*

Office of the Holy Ghost under the Gospel	£0	1	0
Petri Privilegium	0	10	6
Praise, A Sermon on ; with an Indulged Devotion.	0	1	0
Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects. Vols. I. II. and III. each	0	6	0
Sin and its Consequences. Seventh edition. . . .	0	6	0
Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost. Third edition .	0	8	6
Temporal Power of the Pope. Third edition . . .	0	5	0
The Office of the Church in Higher Education . . .	0	0	6
True Story of the Vatican Council. Second Edition .	0	5	0
National Education	0	2	6

MANNING, CARDINAL, Edited by.

Life of the Curé of Ars. New edition, enlarged. . .	0	4	0
---	---	---	---

MIVART, PROF. ST. GEORGE (M.D., F.R.S.)

Nature and Thought. Second edition	0	4	0
"The complete command of the subject, the wide grasp, the subtlety, the readiness of illustration, the grace of style, contrive to render this one of the most admirable books of its class."— <i>British Quarterly Review.</i>			

A Philosophical Catechism. Fifth edition	0	1	0
--	---	---	---

"It should become the *vade mecum* of Catholic students."—*Tablet.*

MONTGOMERY, HON. MRS.

Approved by the Most Rev. George Porter, Archbishop of Bombay.

The Divine Sequence: A Treatise on Creation and Redemption. Cloth	0	3	6
---	---	---	---

The Eternal Years. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. George Porter, Archbishop of Bombay. Cloth	0	3	6
---	---	---	---

The Divine Ideal. Cloth	0	3	6
-----------------------------------	---	---	---

"A work of original thought carefully developed and expressed in lucid and richly imaged style."—*Tablet.*

"The writing of a pious, thoughtful, earnest woman."—*Church Review.*

"Full of truth, and sound reason, and confidence."—*American Catholic Book News.*

MORRIS, REV. JOHN (S.J.)

Letter Books of Sir Amias Poulet, keeper of Mary Queen of Scots. Demy 8vo	0	10	6
---	---	----	---

Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers, related by themselves. Second Series. 8vo, cloth.	0	14	0
---	---	----	---

Third Series	0	14	0
------------------------	---	----	---

The Life of Father John Gerard, S.J. Third edition, rewritten and enlarged	0	14	0
--	---	----	---

The Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas Becket. Second and enlarged edition. In one volume, large post 8vo, cloth, pp. xxxvi., 632,	0	12	6
or bound in two parts, cloth	0	13	0

MURPHY, J. N.

Chair of Peter. Third edition, with the statistics, &c.,
brought down to the present day. 720 pages.

Crown 8vo

£0 6 0

"In a series of clearly written chapters, precise in statement, excellently temperate in tone, the author deals with just those questions regarding the power, claims, and history of the Roman Pontiff which are at the present time of most actual interest."

—*Dublin Review*.

NEWMAN, CARDINAL.

Annotated Translation of Athanasius. 2 vols. . each 0 7 6

Apologia pro Vitâ suâ 0 6 0

Arians of the Fourth Century, The 0 6 0

Callista. An Historical Tale. 0 6 0

Church of the Fathers 0 4 0

Difficulties of Anglicans. Two volumes—

Vol. I. Twelve Lectures 0 7 6

Vol. II. Letter to Dr. Pusey and to the Duke of

Norfolk 0 5 6

Discussions and Arguments 0 6 0

Doctrine of Justification 0 5 0

Dream of Gerontius 0 0 6

Essay on Assent 0 7 6

Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine . . 0 6 0

Essays Critical and Historical. Two volumes, with

Notes each 0 6 0

Essays on Miracles, Two. 1. Of Scripture. 2. Of

Ecclesiastical History 0 6 0

Historical Sketches. Three volumes. . . each 0 6 0

Idea of a University. Lectures and Essays. . . 0 7 0

Loss and Gain. Ninth Edition 0 5 6

Occasional Sermons 0 6 0

Parochial and Plain Sermons. Eight volumes. . each 0 5 0

Present Position of Catholics in England. . . . 0 7 0

Sermons on Subjects of the Day. 0 5 0

Sermons to Mixed Congregations 0 6 0

Theological Tracts 0 8 0

University Sermons 0 5 0

Verses on Various Occasions. 0 6 0

Via Media. Two volumes, with Notes . . . each 0 6 0

NORTHCOTE, VERY REV. J. S. (D.D.)

Roma Sotterranea; or, An Account of the Roman
Catacombs. New edition. Re-written and greatly
enlarged. This work is in three volumes, which
may at present be had separately—

Vol. I. History 1 4 0

Vol. II. Christian Art. 1 4 0

Vol. III. Epitaphs of the Catacombs 0 10 0

The Second and Third Volumes may also be had
bound together in cloth 1 12 0

NORTHCOTE, VERY REV. J. S. (D.D.)—continued.

Visit to the Roman Catacombs: Being a popular
abridgment of the larger work. £0 4 0

Mary in the Gospels 0 3 6

PAYNE, JOHN ORLEBAR, (M.A.)

Records of the English Catholics of 1715. Demy 8vo.

Half-bound, gilt top 0 15 0

"A book of the kind Mr. Payne has given us would have astonished Bishop Milner or Dr. Lingard. They would have treasured it, for both of them knew the value of minute fragments of historical information. The Editor has derived nearly the whole of the information which he has given, from unprinted sources, and we must congratulate him on having found a few incidents here and there which may bring the old times back before us in a most touching manner."—*Tablet*.

"Displays in every page a vast amount of careful, judicious, and conscientious research."—*Freeman's Journal*.

English Catholic Non-Jurors of 1715. Being a Summary of the Register of their Estates, with Genealogical and other Notes, and an Appendix of Unpublished Documents in the Public Record Office. In one Volume. Demy 8vo. 1 1 0

"Every student of the history of our nation, or of families which compose it, cannot but be grateful for a catalogue such as we have here."—*Dublin Review*.

"Most carefully and creditably brought out . . . From first to last, full of social interest and biographical details, for which we may search in vain elsewhere."—*Antiquarian Magazine*.

POOR SISTERS OF NAZARETH, THE.

A descriptive Sketch of Convent Life. By Alice Meynell.

Profusely Illustrated with Drawings especially made
by George Lambert. Large 4to. Boards 0 2 6

A limited number of copies are also issued as an *Edition de Luxe*, containing proofs of the illustrations printed
on one side only of the paper, and handsomely bound. 0 10 6

"Bound in a most artistic cover, illustrated with a naturalness that could only have been born of powerful sympathy; printed clearly, neatly, and on excellent paper, and written with the point, aptness, and ripeness of style which we have learnt to associate with Mrs. Meynell's literature."—*Tablet*.

"Those to whom style in writing is still a joy, will read from beginning to end Mrs. Meynell's utterance on this Hammersmith home of supremest charity."—*Globe*.

"Mrs. Meynell has seldom written anything more simply and tenderly beautiful. She writes not only brightly and charmingly, but very humanly as well."—*Manchester Examiner*.

"A beautifully got-up volume, which will make Nazareth House even better known than it already is, and for that reason, as well as for its merits, deserve success."—*Athenæum*.

POPE, THOMAS ALDER, M.A. (of the Oratory.)

Life of St. Philip Neri, Apostle of Rome. From the
Italian of Alfonso Capececiatratro. 2 vols 0 15 0

"No former life has given us so full a knowledge of the surroundings of St. Philip. . . . To those who have not read the original we can say, with the greatest confidence, that they will find in these two well-edited volumes a very large store of holy reading and of interesting history."—*Dublin Review*.

QUARTERLY SERIES Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 71 volumes published to date.

Selection.

The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier. By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 2 vols.	£0 10 6
The History of the Sacred Passion. By Father Luis de la Palma, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish.	0 5 0
The Life of Dona Louisa de Carvajal. By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Small edition	0 3 6
The Life and Letters of St. Teresa. 3 vols. By Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. each	0 7 6
The Life of Mary Ward. By Mary Catherine Elizabeth Chalmers, of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin. Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 2 vols.	0 15 0
The Return of the King. Discourses on the Latter Days. By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J.	0 7 6
Pious Affections towards God and the Saints. Meditations for every Day in the Year, and for the Principal Festivals. From the Latin of the Ven. Nicolas Lancicius, S.J.	0 7 6
The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ in Meditations for Every Day in the Year. By Fr. Nicolas Avancino, S.J. Two vols.	0 10 6
The Baptism of the King : Considerations on the Sacred Passion. By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J.	0 7 6
The Mother of the King. Mary during the Life of Our Lord.	0 7 6
The Hours of the Passion. Taken from the <i>Life of Christ</i> by Ludolph the Saxon	0 7 6
The Mother of the Church. Mary during the first Apostolic Age	0 6 0
The Life of St. Bridget of Sweden. By the late F. J. M. A. Partridge	0 6 0
The Teachings and Counsels of St. Francis Xavier. From his Letters	0 5 0
Garcia Moreno, President of Ecuador. 1821—1875. From the French of the Rev. P. A. Berthe, C.S.S.R. By Lady Herbert	0 7 6
The Life of St. Alonso Rodriguez. By Francis Goldie, of the Society of Jesus	0 7 6

VOLUMES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD.

The Holy Infancy.

The Preparation of the Incarnation	0 7 6
The Nine Months. The Life of our Lord in the Womb.	0 7 6
The Thirty Years. Our Lord's Infancy and Early Life	0 7 6

The Public Life of Our Lord.

The Ministry of St. John Baptist	0 6 6
--	-------

QUARTERLY SERIES—(*selection*) *continued*.

The Preaching of the Beatitudes	£0 6 6
The Sermon on the Mount (<i>Continued</i>)	0 6 6
The Sermon on the Mount (<i>Concluded</i>)	0 6 6
The Training of the Apostles. Parts I., II., III., IV. each	0 6 6
The Preaching of the Cross. Part I.	0 6 6
The Preaching of the Cross. Parts II., III. each	0 6 0
Passiontide. Part I.	0 6 6
Chapters on the Parables of Our Lord	0 7 6

Introductory Volumes.

The Life of our Life. Harmony of the Life of Our Lord, with Introductory Chapters and Indices. Two vols. (Reprinting.)	
The Works and Words of our Saviour, gathered from the Four Gospels	0 7 6
The Story of the Gospels. Harmonised for Meditation	0 7 6

*Full lists on application.***RAM, MRS. ABEL.**

"Emmanuel." Being the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ reproduced in the Mysteries of the Tabernacle. By Mrs. Abel Ram, author of "The most Beautiful among the Children of Men," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth	0 5 0
"The foundation of the structure is laid with the greatest skill and the deepest knowledge of what constitutes true religion, and every chapter ends with an eloquent and soul-inspiring appeal for one or other of the virtues which the different scenes in the life of Our Saviour set prominently into view."— <i>Catholic Times</i> .	

RAWES, THE LATE REV. FR., Edited by.*The Library of the Holy Ghost:—*

Vol. I. St. Thomas Aquinas on the Adorable Sacra- ment of the Altar. With Prayers and Thanksgiv- ings for Holy Communion. Red cloth	0 5 0
---	-------

Little Books of the Holy Ghost:—(List on application.)**RICHARDS, REV. WALTER J. B. (D.D.)**

Manual of Scripture History. Being an Analysis of the Historical Books of the Old Testament. By the Rev. W. J. B. Richards, D.D., Oblate of St. Charles; In- specter of Schools in the Diocese of Westminster. Cloth	0 4 0
--	-------

"Happy indeed will those children and young persons be who
acquire in their early days the inestimably precious knowledge
which these books impart."—*Tablet*.

RYDER, REV. H. I. D. (of the Oratory.)

Catholic Controversy: A Reply to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons." Sixth edition	0 2 6
---	-------

"Father Ryder of the Birmingham Oratory, has now furnished
in a small volume a masterly reply to this assailant from without.
The lighter charms of a brilliant and graceful style are added to the
solid merits of this handbook of contemporary controversy."—*Irish
Monthly*.

SOULIER, REV. P.

Life of St. Philip Benizi, of the Order of the Servants
of Mary. Crown 8vo

£0 8 0

"A clear and interesting account of the life and labours of this
eminent Servant of Mary."—*American Catholic Quarterly*.

"Very scholar-like, devout and complete."—*Dublin Review*.

STANTON, REV. R. (of the Oratory.)

A Menology of England and Wales; or, Brief Mem-
orials of the British and English Saints, arranged
according to the Calendar. Together with the Mar-
tyrs of the 16th and 17th centuries. Compiled by
order of the Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops
of the Province of Westminster. Demy 8vo, cloth

0 14 0

THOMPSON, EDWARD HEALY, (M.A.)

The Life of Jean-Jacques Olier, Founder of the
Seminary of St. Sulpice. New and Enlarged Edition.
Post 8vo, cloth, pp. xxxvi. 628

0 15 0

"It provides us with just what we most need, a model to look up to
and imitate; one whose circumstances and surroundings were suffi-
ciently like our own to admit of an easy and direct application to our
own personal duties and daily occupations."—*Dublin Review*.

The Life and Glories of St. Joseph, Husband of
Mary, Foster-Father of Jesus, and Patron of the
Universal Church. Grounded on the Dissertations of
Canon Antonio Vitalis, Father José Moreno, and other
writers. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. xxvi., 488,

0 6 0

ULLATHORNE, ARCHBISHOP.

Endowments of Man, &c. Popular edition.

0 7 0

Groundwork of the Christian Virtues: do.

0 7 0

Christian Patience, . . . do. do.

0 7 0

Ecclesiastical Discourses

0 6 0

Memoir of Bishop Willson.

0 2 6

WARD, WILFRID.

The Clothes of Religion. A reply to popular Positivism

0 3 6

"Very witty and interesting."—*Spectator*.

"Really models of what such essays should be."—*Church Quarterly
Review*.

WATERWORTH, REV. J.

The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Œcumenical
Council of Trent, celebrated under the Sovereign
Pontiffs, Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV., tran-
slated by the Rev. J. WATERWORTH. To which
are prefixed Essays on the External and Internal
History of the Council. A new edition. Demy
8vo, cloth

0 10 6

WISEMAN, CARDINAL.

Fabiola. A Tale of the Catacombs. . . . 3s. 6d. and

0 4 0

Also a new and splendid edition printed on large
quarto paper, embellished with thirty-one full-page
illustrations, and a coloured portrait of St. Agnes.
Handsomely bound.

1 1 0